



FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

Univerzita Karlova

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Bc. Andrea Podsedníková

Adjektivní evaluativní vzorce v časopisech o životním
stylu

Adjectival evaluative patterns in lifestyle magazines

Praha, srpen 2018

Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Markéta Malá, Ph.D.

Děkuji vedoucí práce doc. PhDr. Markétě Malé, Ph.D. za její cenné rady a odborné vedení při vypracovávání této práce.

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu. Souhlasím se zapůjčením diplomové práce ke studijním účelům.

V Praze dne 4. 8. 2018

Abstrakt

Diplomová práce se zaměřuje na klasifikaci, popis a srovnání výskytu evaluativních adjektiv a adjektivních evaluativních vzorců ve dvou časopisech o životním stylu, Cosmopolitanu (pro ženy) a Esquire (pro muže). V teoretické části jsou prezentovány obecné informace o evaluaci a evaluativním jazyce, o lokálních gramatikách, časopisech o životním stylu a rozdílech mezi ženami a muži v používání jazykových prostředků. Materiál pro praktickou část je čerpán z internetových článků Cosmopolitanu a Esquire, ve kterých jsou pomocí programu TagAnt označované slovní druhy, analýza dále probíhá pomocí korpusového programu AntConc. První část analýzy obsahuje popis a srovnání nejfrekventovanějších evaluativních adjektiv použitých v obou korpusech, druhý úsek vychází z evaluativních vzorců popsaných v teoretické části diplomové práce, vyhledává jejich výskyt, případné variance a vzorce, které ještě nebyly popsány.

Klíčová slova: Evaluace, časopisy o životním stylu, lokální gramatika, evaluativní vzorce

Abstract

The present thesis focuses on the classification, description and comparison of evaluative adjectives occurring in two lifestyle magazines, Cosmopolitan (for women) and Esquire (for men). The theoretical part presents general information on evaluation and evaluative language, local grammars, lifestyle magazines and differences between the use of language by women and men. The material for the analysis is drawn from online articles published by Cosmopolitan and Esquire which are part-of-speech tagged using the freeware Part-Of-Speech tagger TagAnt, the analysis is carried out using the corpus analysis software AntConc. The initial part of the analysis describes and compares the most frequently used evaluative adjectives in the two corpora. The final section uses the patterns presented in the theoretical part of the thesis as a starting point; the two corpora are searched to find their occurrences, potential variations and patterns that have not been described previously.

Key words: Evaluation, lifestyle magazines, local grammars, evaluative patterns

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	8
2	Theoretical background	9
2.1	Evaluation – definitions	9
2.2	Functions of evaluation.....	10
2.3	Recognizing evaluation.....	12
3	Local grammars	16
3.1	Local grammars – definitions	16
3.2	The pattern approach	19
3.3	Evaluative patterns.....	20
4	Lifestyle magazines	26
4.1	Identity, lifestyle and values	26
4.2	Language of lifestyle magazines.....	29
5	Gender differences in language use.....	31
6	Material and method.....	33
6.1	Material.....	33
6.2	Method	33
7	Frequency of evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire	35
7.1	Frequency lists and comparison.....	35
7.2	Evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire	36
7.2.1	Emotivity	37
7.2.2	Expectedness	41
7.2.3	Importance	42
7.2.4	Reliability	43
7.2.5	Ease.....	44
7.2.6	Rightness	45

7.3	Evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire – conclusion	46
8	Evaluative patterns in Cosmopolitan and Esquire.....	48
8.1	<i>IT</i> + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated)	48
8.2	<i>THERE</i> + LINK VERB + <i>SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING</i> (hinge)+ ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + <i>ABOUT/IN</i> (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/ <i>-ING</i> CLAUSE (thing evaluated).....	50
8.3	Patterns with link verb and <i>to</i> -infinitive clause	51
8.4	Patterns with link verb and <i>that</i> -clause.....	54
8.5	Patterns with general nouns	56
8.6	Adjective complementation	59
8.7	Graded adjectives.....	62
8.7.1	Comparative and superlative adjectives	62
8.7.2	ADJECTIVE GROUP + <i>ENOUGH</i>	63
8.7.3	<i>TOO</i> + ADJECTIVE GROUP.....	64
8.7.4	<i>SOMETHING AS</i> + ADJECTIVE GROUP + <i>AS</i> + NOUN GROUP.....	65
8.8	Predicative adjective patterns	65
8.9	Evaluative patterns in Cosmopolitan and Esquire – conclusion.....	65
9	Conclusion.....	68
10	References and Sources.....	71
11	České résumé.....	75

List of figures and tables

Table 1: Dictionary definition - parsing with a general grammar18

Table 2: Dictionary definition - parsing with a local grammar18

Table 3: Number of occurrences of evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire
corpora36

Table 4: The most frequent evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire.....37

1 Introduction

The area of evaluative language is quite complex and vague, encompassing many notions such as emotivity, modality and evidentiality. Consequently, it performs various functions, including expressing opinion, maintaining relationships and organizing the discourse. Due to its subjective nature, evaluation is not always easy to recognize and categorize, but there are some indicators that are always present in evaluative language, i.e. it is comparative, subjective and value-laden. Since evaluative language is a rather specific area of linguistics, traditional grammar with its phrase structure rules does not offer the best tools to analyse it. Due to the distinctive nature of evaluative language, it is more convenient to examine it using a local grammar, which describes the syntactic behaviour of groups of elements with the emphasis on their pragmatic functions, using terms such as 'Evaluator' 'Thing evaluated' and 'Evaluating response'. Using these categories, we can identify a number of evaluative adjectival patterns, some of which lend evaluative meaning even to adjectives with otherwise neutral meanings.

The concept of lifestyle has been becoming increasingly prominent in the past decades, and media have played an essential role in its promotion. They shape values and identities of large masses of people and have the power to legitimize certain social practices, such as excessive grooming, making it seem necessary to buy products that they advertise. The language of evaluation plays a large role in this, constantly invoking and shaping the values of the readers. In spite of the tendency to replace the traditional social indicators such as class and gender by individual style, there is still some evidence of different linguistic strategies and word choices employed by men and women, especially in the area of emotivity; women generally tend to use more 'emotional' expressions (especially adjectives) than men, who are more reserved in this respect. Judging by these characteristics, it could be expected that the use and distribution of evaluative adjectives as well as evaluative adjectival patterns in the two magazines will differ in certain respects, especially in the more frequent use of 'emotional' adjectives and patterns in which they tend to occur in *Cosmopolitan*. Nevertheless, since both the magazines have the same aim, i.e. to advertise the products they introduce, it is likely that some of the strategies employed, including the use of evaluative adjectives and patterns, will be similar.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Evaluation – definitions

Expressing opinion is a rather complex phenomenon, encompassing several different language areas, such as opinions of likelihood (i.e. modality) and those of goodness (attitude). Sometimes, different terms, such as *attitude*, *appraisal*, and *stance*, are used to label it, but each of these labels denotes only a specific area of the whole phenomenon (Hunston and Thompson, 2000: 2-5). If we choose the ‘combining approach’ and treat modality and attitudinal meaning as two sides of one coin, a superordinate term must be found, and *evaluation* is the obvious candidate. Hunston and Thompson (2000: 5) express some reservations about the term, as it is “as slippery as any of the others” and is sometimes used to describe different phenomena in the same field, but they insist it is practical due to its “syntactic and morphological flexibility”. They claim that the word is user-oriented, since it is the user who does the evaluation, and it expresses that the user ascribes values to the things and propositions evaluated. The term *evaluation* will therefore be used throughout this paper.

Hunston and Thompson (2000: 5) define evaluation as a “broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. That attitude may relate to certainty or obligation or desirability or any of a number of other sets of values”. Bednarek (2007: 2) also chooses the combining approach and explains *evaluation* as “the linguistic expression of speaker/writer opinion along a number of semantic dimensions or parameters. That is, evaluation can relate to judgments of entities/propositions as good or bad, important or unimportant, comprehensible or incomprehensible, likely or unlikely, genuine or fake, expected or unexpected etc.” She notes that evaluation encompasses the notions of affect, modality and evidentiality. Du Bois (2007: 143) defines evaluative language as “the process whereby a stancetaker orients to an object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value.”

To summarize the definitions cited above, we could say that evaluative language expresses the speaker’s attitudes or feelings about the topic discussed, be it opinions about

the goodness/badness, the likelihood or any other aspect of the proposition. Now that the definitions of evaluation have been established, we can move on to discussing its functions.

2.2 Functions of evaluation

Evaluation is an essential part of human communication and performs a number of roles in verbal exchange. White (2004a) distinguishes two main areas of evaluation: emotion and opinion, which perform different functions in evaluation patterns:

I will use the term ‘emotion’ in essentially its everyday sense to label attitudinal assessments which are indicated through descriptions of the emotional reactions or states of human subjects. I will use the term ‘opinion’ in a rather narrower sense than is customary in everyday usage to label positive or negative assessments [...] under which a positive or negative quality is said to be an inherent property of the phenomenon being evaluated.¹

White (2004a) notes that opinion can be divided into appreciation (opinion about aesthetics) and judgement (opinion about ethics). Bednarek (2009: 166) further divides the category of emotion (‘affect’) into overt affect whose resources “directly name an emotional response of Emoters (*fear, love, hate*)” and covert affect, whose resources denote such an emotional response only indirectly. These areas of evaluation are reflected in its functions.

Hunston and Thompson (2000: 6) distinguish three main functions of evaluation:

1. To express the speaker’s or writer’s opinion, and in doing so to reflect the value system of that person and their community.

¹ White, Peter R.R. (2004a) ‘Subjectivity, evaluation and point of view in media discourse’ In Caroline Coffin (ed.) *Applying English grammar: Functional and corpus approaches*, London: Arnold, 229–246. Cited in Bednarek, M. (2009) ‘Language patterns and attitude’. *Functions of Language* 16:2, 166. Available on-line from <http://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/fol.16.2.01bed> (accessed: 15 May 2018)

2. To construct and maintain relations between the speaker or writer and hearer or reader.
3. To organize the discourse.

As they note, a single act of evaluation may perform two or three of these functions simultaneously, as they are not mutually exclusive and often occur together.

The first function of evaluation, expressing opinion, reveals what the speaker or writer feels or thinks about a given topic, but that is only one part of a more complex process. Our opinions are largely formed on the basis of a value-system rooted in our own society, and every time evaluation is expressed, it “goes towards building up that value-system. This value-system in turn is a component of the ideology which lies behind every text. Thus, identifying what the writer thinks reveals the ideology of the society that has produced the text” (Hunston and Thompson, 2000: 6). That is, every time we carry out an act of evaluation, not only does it express our own opinion, but it also says a lot about the society we live in. Hunston and Thompson (p. 8) go on to explain that ideologies are quite subtle, not expressed overtly but rather transmitted through texts which show their true nature. Evaluation is essential in the study of ideologies, because they are “essentially sets of values – what counts as good or bad, what should or should not happen, what counts as true or untrue”.

Another, more subtle, role of evaluation is creating and maintaining relationships between the speaker/writer and the recipient. Hunston and Thompson (2000: 8) name three main areas which are connected to evaluation, namely manipulation, hedging and politeness; each of them can be used to build a certain type of relationship with the addressee. According to Hunston and Thompson, “[e]valuation can be used to manipulate the reader, to persuade him or her to see things in a particular way”. When used in a text, evaluation is inflicted on the recipient, who is likely to accept it as a fact, together with all the factual information. The less obvious the evaluation in the text is, the more likely the recipient is to accept it as a given fact. Some summarizing nouns can have an evaluative denotation (e.g. *nonsense*), and other word classes, such as some conjunctions (e.g. *but*) can influence the way the information is processed as well (pp. 9-10). Hoey (1983: 95) notes that “[e]xpressing something as a problem [...] makes it difficult for the reader not to accept it as such. [...] it takes a conscious effort of detachment for the reader

not to identify with the writer's point of view, or the ideology that underlies it." He asserts that it is very difficult to challenge evaluation, and it is therefore a very powerful tool when trying to manipulate people, when the focus of the proposition is in fact something else. Hedging is another tool a writer or speaker can use to connect with the recipient. According to Channel (1994: 197), they are markers of vagueness in communication, and although they seem to be empty fillers, they are often "deliberately chosen for their contribution to the communicative message". It is frequently used in academic writing to moderate the certainty of their knowledge claims, or to tone down "not one's claims for one's research, but one's language".² Some writers also use it "in an unexpected way, leaving their most contentious claims unmodified" (Hunston and Thompson, 2000: 10).

The third function of evaluation according to Hunston and Thompson (2000: 12-13) is organizing the discourse. Evaluation is one of the tools used to signal when the discourse begins and when it ends. Sinclair argues that evaluation gives clues to people as to how the discourse is organized, e.g. when a teacher says "That's right", it is clear that the student's turn is over. If some kind of evaluation fails to occur in a story, it is likely that the recipient will wonder what the point of the story was. The evaluation indicates what the point of the story is as well as the expected reaction of the hearer.³

2.3 Recognizing evaluation

Evaluation may be quite difficult to recognize, as some types of evaluation are less obvious than others. As Hunston and Thompson (2000: 14-16) claim, evaluation can be assessed linguistically, since some lexical items, such as adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs, are quite clearly evaluative (e.g. *beautiful*, *luckily*, *triumph*, *doubt*). Corpus studies can help us recognize evaluative items that are evaluative in certain contexts only; the

² Myers, G. (1990) *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press. Cited in Hunston, S., and G. Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 10.

³ Sinclair, J. M. (1987) *Mirror for a text?*. MS. University of Birmingham. Cited in Hunston, S., and G. Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11.

surrounding lexical items can give us a clue (e.g. lexis of subjectivity, comparison, positively evaluating lexis, concession clauses). Klimczak and Dynel (2018: 8) demonstrate that evaluation “can be performed with the use of parameters of evaluation along chosen semantic dimensions that relate to emotivity and expectedness”; the emotivity dimension expresses the emotivity evaluation, whereas the expectedness dimension shows whether the entity is expected or unexpected. The emotivity evaluation involves positive/negative feelings of the speaker, e.g.

The situation is deteriorating.

The expectedness evaluation expresses the likelihood of something happening rather than the evaluation of the entity itself, e.g.

The company will probably have a new owner (p. 8).

As has already been mentioned, evaluation can be recognized not only through lexis, but also certain grammatical features. Labov claims that departing from the “basic narrative syntax” can carry an evaluative force. The departures are listed as:

1. intensifiers, such as gestures, expressive phonology, quantifiers (e.g. *all*), repetition, and ritual utterances (e.g. *And there it was*)
2. comparators, listed by Labov as negatives, futures, modals, quasimodals, questions, imperatives, *or*-clauses, superlatives, and comparatives
3. correlatives, including progressives, appended particles (non-finite ‘-ing’ clauses), double appositives, and attributives (e.g. *a knife, a long one, a dagger; a great big guy*);
4. explicatives, that is, clauses introduced by subordinators such as *while, though, since, or because* and other connections between clauses.⁴

⁴ Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. Cited in Hunston, S., and G. Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 18.

Another way to recognize evaluation is through the three main characteristics important for evaluation: it is “comparative, subjective, and value-laden”, and therefore, when looking for evaluation, these signs should be present. Subjectivity (e.g. *I’m fed up*) expresses the speaker’s opinions or feelings, values indicate whether the topic being discussed is good, i.e. helps somebody achieve their goals, or bad, i.e. hinders the achievement of the goal (Hunston and Thompson, 2000: 13). The comparative nature of evaluation means that “evaluation consists of anything which is compared to or contrasts with the norm,” e.g. “the use of a negative, which compares what is not with what might be” (p. 13). In the next section, markers of each of these evaluation features will be discussed.

Markers of subjectivity are a large group of lexical items consisting of “modals and other markers of (un)certainty; non-identifying adjectives; certain adverbs, nouns, and verbs; sentence adverbs and conjunctions; report and attribution structures; marked clause structures, including patterns beginning with *it* and *there*, and ‘Special Operations Clauses’ [...] such as pseudo-clefts” (Hunston and Thompson, 2000: 21-2). Some examples of markers of subjectivity are:

***There is nothing sacrosanct** about this unit of analysis* (pattern beginning with *there*)

*But there is something infallibly **depressing** about Blackpool* (non-identifying adjective)

*This is a **disappointment*** (evaluating noun) (Bednarek, 2009: 167-170)

Some of the typical markers of value are “modality, negation, ‘packaging’ of proposition in *that*- and *wh*-clauses in a way that makes them available to be commented on” (Hunston and Thompson, 22-3). Markers of comparison include “comparative adjectives and adverbs, adverbs of degree, comparator adverbs such as *just*, *only*, at least, expressions of negativity, such as *not*, *never*, *hardly*, [...] *fail*” (pp. 21-2). Examples of markers of value and comparison include:

*This is **not good enough** to allow people into the government of Northern Ireland*
(value - negation)

*it was hard to imagine **more despicable** words* (comparison – comparative adjective)
(Bednarek, 2007: 4-21)

To sum up, evaluation can be recognized by paying attention to evaluative lexical items, but also to the surrounding lexical items of expressions (e.g. adjectives) that are not clearly evaluative. The non-lexical features that can be used to express evaluation are e.g. departures from basic narrative syntax, such as intensifiers, comparators and correlatives.

3 Local grammars

3.1 Local grammars – definitions

Another concept that needs to be introduced for the purposes of this thesis are *local grammars*. According to Bednarek (2007: 3), they are “essentially descriptions of particular areas of language (rather than the language as a whole), such as dictionary definitions, newspaper headlines, the language of cause and effect or the language of evaluation.” Each local grammar is focused on one area of language only, and each local grammar uses concepts and labels suitable for its individual functional categories (e.g. *Definiens* for definitions, and *Evaluative category* for evaluative language).

Mason (p.2) introduces the phenomenon from a slightly different perspective, noting that a local grammar is “a way of describing the syntactic behaviour of groups of individual elements, which are related but whose similarities cannot easily be expressed using phrase structure rules.” He goes on to explain that local grammars are constructed for recurring constructions such as date expressions, and those local grammars can then be used to describe larger constructions. Local grammars are especially suitable in the description of (semi-)fixed phrases which allow for some variation with little change in meaning. Some of the examples of this used by Gross are:

1. Bob lost his cool.
2. Bob lost his temper.
3. Bob lost his self-control.
4. Bob blew a fuse.
5. Bob blew his cool.

As Gross (1993: 30) states, these sentences are synonymous and their similarities can be captured using local grammars, which can be more helpful than traditional grammar in such cases. The concept of local grammars was introduced due to the inadequacy of traditional grammatical models in dealing with specific areas of language and incorporating some of the pragmatic parameters. Local grammars differ from general grammars in several respects: general grammars describe the “internal functioning of the

components of a grammar, how they relate to each other, and how they create units of meaning”, whereas local grammars are simpler, easier for learners, and use more transparent and reliable category labels than the general ones (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 79).

Software parsing can be very useful when describing regular grammar features, but it is limited in the description of various irregularities and ‘leftovers’, such as “punctuation, variable idioms, speech representation, and special conventions for expressing such things as names, addresses, titles and amounts of money” (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 76). As Gross hints, these unpredictable structures are difficult to generalize, and are therefore not of much interest to grammarians who seek for universal truths rather than irregularities. The structures are however essential for translators, language learners and other grammar users, who cannot ignore the irregular parts of language. Using local grammars is an ideal approach when dealing with this problem.⁵ Tables 1 and 2 show the differences between parsing a dictionary definition with a general grammar and local grammar.⁶

⁵ Gross, M. (1993). ‘Local grammars and their representation by finite automata’. Cited in Hunston, S. and J. Sinclair (2000) ‘A local grammar of evaluation’. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76.

⁶ Barnbrook, G., and J. M. Sinclair (1995) ‘Parsing Cobuild Entries’. Cited in Hunston, S. (2002) *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155.

subject	verb	complement
<i>An abstract of an article or speech</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>a short piece of writing that summarizes the main points of it.</i>

Table 1: Dictionary definition - parsing with a general grammar

left-hand side: the thing defined	link- word	right-hand side: the definition		
headword	hinge	discriminator	superordinate	discriminator
<i>An abstract of an article or speech</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>a short</i>	<i>piece of writing</i>	<i>that summarizes the main points of it.</i>

Table 2: Dictionary definition - parsing with a local grammar

As Hunston (2011: 142-3) notes, a local grammar should be a ‘functional grammar’, which “would label each element of an analysed unit in terms that related directly to its discourse function”. This works especially well in the description of definitions, but it is slightly more difficult to apply to the language of evaluation. Unlike definitions, whose sole function is to define, evaluative clauses serve more purposes than just to evaluate. Moreover, there is a ready-made corpus of definitions, but no such corpus exists for evaluative sentences. An approach that has proven to be more useful in the study of evaluation is to take certain patterns and words that are clearly evaluative (e.g. *nuisance* and *difficult*) and to parse them using terminology such as ‘Evaluator’ and ‘Evaluated entity’. The pattern approach will be discussed in more detail in the section *The pattern approach*.

To sum up, local grammars are descriptions of specific areas of language rather than a language as a whole, describing the syntactic behaviour of related groups of elements within these language areas. These groups of elements are often recurring semi-fixed or fixed constructions with little variation in meaning. Local grammars are especially useful in describing certain areas of language, such as dictionary definitions or the language of evaluation, whose function cannot be adequately captured using traditional grammar. In the case of the language of evaluation, it is especially convenient to use the pattern approach which will be discussed in the next section.

3.2 The pattern approach

Connected with the concept of local grammars is the pattern approach, developed by Hunston and Francis (2000). They identified a number of evaluative adjective patterns, which make up a local grammar of evaluation. The patterns use general grammar categories, such as nouns, adjectives and verbs (Bednarek, 2007: 4-5). Local grammars have the advantage of being more transparent, accurate and having a cumulative coverage (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 74). As Hunston and Sinclair assert, it is most efficient to explore the language of evaluation only in lexical terms, since it does not have its own grammar in the traditional sense, and trying to fit the description of the specific area of language into general grammar categories would not bring good results. They therefore suggest that when describing the local grammar of evaluation, one should focus on identifying the structures that are used with the evaluative expressions examined (p. 74).

The question that arises when trying to describe the patterns in which evaluative adjectives are used is whether there is an infinite number of patterns used in evaluative language or whether only a limited number of patterns exists. Hunston and Sinclair note that if there was a limited number of patterns, it would be very helpful in describing evaluative language as automatic parsing would be possible (p. 82). As was mentioned above, it is impossible to make a list of all evaluative adjectives, as seemingly neutral adjectives can take on an evaluative meaning when used in certain contexts. This means that we cannot simply program a computer with a list of evaluative adjectives and look for the patterns they are used in. Instead, we must identify the patterns in which evaluative adjectives are used and in which neutral adjectives can gain an evaluative meaning. Two major surveys of words and their patterns have been carried out (Francis et al. 1996, and Francis et al. 1998), which revealed that “every sense of every word can be described in terms of the patterns it commonly occurs in; and [...] that words which share a particular pattern typically also share a meaning.” (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 83). That means that it should be possible to make a finite list of evaluative patterns and assign one meaning to each of them, which would make the study of the local grammar of evaluation clear and systematic. Hunston and Sinclair note that from these patterns and the adjectives used in them, it should be possible to see which adjectives are evaluative and which are

not (p.84). In the next section, the pattern approach will be discussed in more detail, introducing several specific evaluative patterns found in two studies.

3.3 Evaluative patterns

In their study, Hunston and Sinclair present six patterns that are often used to evaluate. Using these patterns, they strive to identify evaluative adjectives and to demonstrate that using a local grammar of evaluation, it is possible to parse sentences containing these patterns (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 84). Bednarek compares evaluative patterns in ten British ‘popular’ and ‘quality’ newspapers, examining evaluative adjective patterns in her corpus and comparing the patterns found in the respective types of newspapers (Bednarek, 2007: 1). Bednarek grouped the patterns that she found into eight groups, using some of those identified by Hunston and Sinclair (2000), and adding some new patterns that she found in her own data. In accordance with the theory of local grammars, Bednarek assigns simple transparent categories (e.g. *Thing evaluated*, *Hinge*, *Evaluative category*, *Restriction on evaluation*) to each part of the pattern, which makes the analysis of the patterns easy to orientate in (p. 7). In the next section of the thesis, the evaluative patterns identified by Hunston and Sinclair and Bednarek will be presented, discussed shortly, and some examples will be introduced.

1. *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated)

Francis (1993: 137-56) states that all adjectives used in this pattern carry evaluative meaning; some of the examples are *fortunate*, *heartening*, *splendid*, *wonderful*; *awful*, *stupid*, *terrible*. As Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 84) note, all adjectives occurring in this pattern being evaluative means that the pattern is very good for ‘diagnosing’ evaluative adjectives. Moreover, it is easy to use parsing with this pattern, as “there is only one configuration mapping the pattern onto the parsing categories”. Bednarek states that in this pattern, the adjective group is the *evaluative category*, as it realises the process of evaluation by the speaker or writer, and the entity being evaluated is realized by the finite or non-finite clause (Bednarek, 2007: 3). Examples from Bednarek’s corpus include

it was hard to imagine more despicable words

it is hypocritical and scandalous that she has been treated in this way

2. *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge)+
ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN
GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated)

According to Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 85-6), this pattern is typically used to give subjective judgement of something, usually expressing whether the thing evaluated is good or bad. The adjectives used are usually evaluative but sometimes nationality adjectives can occur (e.g. *There is something very American about the National Archives collection of presidential libraries*). Nationality adjectives express something being typical of the nationality discussed. In this case, the pattern does not present an opinion of ‘goodness’ or ‘badness’. The pattern is very productive. As Bednarek notes, evaluation is expressed directly through attitudinal lexical items rather than being implied by the surrounding lexis. It is adjectives such as *irritating, abnormal, crude, tragic, odd* etc. that express the evaluation in this pattern (Bednarek, 2007: 2). Examples of this pattern are

there is something empty about such shots

there is something unusual about me

3. Patterns with link verb and *to*-infinitive clause

The basic pattern of this group is NOUN GROUP + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP + *TO*- INFINITIVE CLAUSE. As Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 87) assert, “the relationship between the subject of the main clause and the verb in the *to*-infinitive clause varies”, as the subject of the main clause functions as the subject of the *to*-infinitive clause with some adjectives, while it is the object of the *to*-infinitive clause with others. Moreover, the adjective can express a direct evaluation of the thing or person (e.g. *Horses are pretty to look at*), or it can “indicate [...] a personal response to the situation (e.g. *Benjamin had been rather overawed to meet them*)” (p. 87). This is a more variable pattern, with different configurations for parsing. A variety of adjectives is used in this pattern, and making an exhaustive list would be impossible, but a list of the most frequently used adjectives could be made (p. 88). The pattern has “different functional

mappings”, i.e. some of the components can take on different roles, depending on the particular sentence:

- i. Thing evaluated + Evaluative category + Restriction
[T]hey (the police) will be powerless to stop the woman they have dubbed La Madame Anglaise)
- ii. Evaluation carrier + Evaluative category + Restriction
He (Dica) is likely to receive high-quality medical care
- iii. Evaluator + Evaluating response + Thing evaluated
Mark Palios, the FA’s new chief executive is anxious to set football a new disciplinary agenda (Bednarek, 2007: 7).

4. Patterns with link verb and *that*-clause

According to Bednarek (2007: 7), these patterns are realized by NOUN GROUP + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP + *THAT*- CLAUSE. Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 88-9) state that most of the adjectives used in this pattern “indicate a personal reaction to a state of affairs (e.g. *amazed*, [...] *worried*), or someone’s degree of certainty or awareness of something (e.g. *aware*, [...] *sceptical*), or an attitude towards the future (e.g. *afraid*, [...] *worried*), or a way of talking about a state of affairs (e.g. *adamant*, [...] *resolute*)”, and it could therefore be said that the pattern is most often used to attribute evaluation to someone. Some adjectives are used to express whether something is desirable or undesirable (e.g. *fortunate*, *lucky*). In this pattern, the noun group realizes the Evaluator and the *that*-clause the thing evaluated. Examples from Bednarek’s (2007) corpus include:

I am disappointed that it has taken Burrell six years to reveal this extraordinary
The FA is confident it can defend any action under the strict rules governing
doping (p. 7)

5. Patterns with general nouns

As Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 90-91) state, the adjectives in these patterns usually premodify general nouns, such as *thing* or *point*. “The noun group is followed by a link

verb and another noun group or finite or non- finite clause of some kind. The first noun group may be followed by a preposition phrase, often beginning with *about*". These patterns do not include evaluative adjectives, but, as Bednarek (2007: 8-9) asserts, they are very similar to the patterns which do include them, as saying *This is a bad thing* is very similar to saying *This is bad*, the only difference being in endomorphic emphasis. Three patterns using general nouns were found by Bednarek:

- i. NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category)

it is the last thing we need

- ii. NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category) + PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE (evaluating context) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated)

the only thing extravagant about him was the cocktail of lies he showered me with every day.

This pattern is similar to the pseudo-cleft pattern introduced by Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 89-90), which contains *WHAT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP, followed by the verb *be*, a noun group or a finite or non-finite clause. There can be a prepositional phrase following the adjective group, often beginning with *about*.

What's very good about this play is that it broadens people's view.

- iii. NOUN GROUP (Evaluation carrier) + 'VOLITION' (Hinge) + *DO THE DECENT THING* (Evaluative category) + 'ELABORATOR' (Hinge) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (Thing evaluated)

As Bednarek notes, this pattern is "on the borderline of being a 'true' pattern", as it contains the idiomatic expression *do the decent thing*. An example of this pattern can be *He won't do the decent thing and resign* (Bednarek, 2007: 8-9).

6. Adjective complementation

According to Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 96), adjective complementation is typical for evaluative adjectives. This pattern is realized by NOUN GROUP + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP + PP. Bednarek found two patterns involving adjective complementation:

- i. Evaluator + Evaluating response + Thing evaluated
they were furious with the judgment
- ii. Thing evaluated + Evaluating category + Restriction on evaluation
whose views are vital to modern Tory kingmaking (Bednarek, 2007: 10)

7. Graded adjectives

Patterns including graded adjectives are variable, concerning adjectives with *too*, *enough* (e.g. *not good enough*), comparative and superlative adjectives. As Bednarek (2007: 10) notes, there are a large number of variations of this pattern. Some examples include

*This is not good enough to allow people into the government of Northern Ireland
...which is cheaper than anything he can get through his own company
...the Blair Government being the most corrupt, dishonest and incompetent of
modern times* (pp.10-11)

Among these patterns, Bednarek found the pattern *SOMETHING AS* + ADJECTIVE GROUP + *AS* + NOUN GROUP (e.g. *it would be something as huge as this*), in which evaluative adjectives tend to be used (p. 11).

8. Predicative adjective patterns

The last group involves predicative adjective patterns, i.e. NOUN GROUP + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP. The patterns that Bednarek (2007: 11) identified differ in their semantic mapping.

- i. Thing evaluated + Evaluative category

the whole choreography is farcical

- ii. Thing evaluated + Evaluative category + Evaluator

a game which is so important not only to myself, but also the team and the England fans

- iii. Evaluator + Evaluating response

I am absolutely devastated (pp. 11-12)

In short, eight most prominent groups of patterns with variations were found in the studies presented. Most of them include adjectives but even patterns with general nouns can carry a meaning similar to that of evaluative adjectives. The patterns introduced in this section will be further examined in the practical part of the thesis. In the next section, the topic of lifestyle magazines will be discussed.

4 Lifestyle magazines

In the next section, lifestyle magazines will be introduced from several perspectives. The key phenomena connected with lifestyle magazines, such as identity, lifestyle and values will be defined and discussed. Finally, the language of lifestyle magazines and its effects on readers will be presented.

4.1 Identity, lifestyle and values

In order to be able to discuss lifestyle, we first need to introduce the concept of identity, since the two are closely related. Identity is rather difficult to define, with many different meanings, applications and nuances, but some of its basic characteristics can be pinpointed. As Merry (2010: 2) observes, identity “normally refers to the complex and ever-evolving expressions of self-understanding that describe how persons relate, and form attachments, to their historical–social–cultural environment over a lifetime and consciously or unconsciously arrange their priorities and commitments to reflect those, sometimes conflicting, attachments.” It “denotes an understanding of who we are, as individuals, and not merely as products of history, culture, or caste”. To sum up, identity could be characterized as a unique inherent quality that each individual possesses and that consists of many inner as well as outer influences.

The notion of lifestyle has been becoming more and more prominent in the past decades. As the concept of social class is diminishing, lifestyle is beginning to replace it and becoming more important (Machin and Leeuwen, 2005: 577). Lifestyle was preceded by two other concepts: individual and social style. Individual style expresses a person’s personality and attitudes which cannot be socially regulated. Social style, on the other hand, expresses our social position (class, gender, age etc.) and has no psychological motivation. Lifestyle is a combination of the two – it is a style of a group of people who can be dispersed all around the world and is characterized by shared attitudes to social issues, similar leisure time activities and consumer behaviours (pp. 579-84). Closely connected with the concept of lifestyle is consumerism. According to Zablocki and Kanter, identity “has come to be generated in the consumption rather than in the

production realm”⁷. It is therefore not surprising that media have come to be the most notable mediators of lifestyle in the past decades (Hanke, 1989: 221-38). Machin and Leeuwen (2005: 584-8) observe that the traditional social indicators such as gender, age and class, have been replaced by techniques classifying people according to their attitudes and consumption patterns. The old social indicators are becoming less important and distinctions between styles specifically designed for individual genders, social classes etc. are being replaced by deliberate creation of individual styles. These individual styles are created by a combination of already existing styles which have lost their original functions; the new styles are therefore hybrid styles “expressing a particular combination of meanings deriving from connotations (associations we have, places, times etc.)”.

From these definitions, a lifestyle magazine can be understood to be “one that seeks to provide its readers with features on the whole range of products and activities that are perceived to be important to the way that they (aspire to) live and identify themselves” (Hollow, 2011: 19). As Hollow notes, the lifestyle magazine is a genre focused on self-improvement; it entices its readers to strive for new and exciting things, for an ideal life, to escape from reality (p. 18). The central topics of lifestyle magazines are questions of individual identity and the self, which, according to Johnson, are currently the key phenomena that government practices and other modes of control take advantage of.⁸ Carey notes that lifestyle magazines function like ‘solitary utopias’, refusing the idea that we can achieve happiness through better social arrangements and replacing it by a pursuit of individual happiness.⁹ Hollow further compares lifestyle magazines to utopias, observing that the main feature that the two genres have in common is trying to make the unbelievable believable. Lifestyle magazines have many ways, including their bright

⁷ Zablocki, B.D., and R.M. Kanter (1976) ‘The Differentiation of Lifestyles’. *Annual Review of Sociology* (2), 269-98. Cited in Machin, D., and T. van Leeuwen (2005) ‘Language style and lifestyle: the case of a global magazine’. *Media, Culture & Society* (27:4), 577. Available on-line from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0163443705054151?journalCode=mcsa> (accessed: 25 May 2018).

⁸ Johnson, T. (1993) ‘Expertise and the state’. In Gane, M. and T. Johnson (eds.) *Foucault’s New Domains*. London: Routledge, 139–152. Cited in Hollow, M. (2011) ‘Perfect lives: Lifestyle magazines and utopian impulses in contemporary British society’. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (15:17), 20. Available on-line from https://www.academia.edu/881284/Perfect_lives_Lifestyle_magazines_and_utopian_impulses_in_contemporary_British_society (accessed: 18 May 2018)

⁹ Carey, J. (1999) *The Faber Book of Utopias*. London: Faber. Cited in Hollow, 2011: 20.

covers and sensational headlines, to make people believe that the “wonderful worlds of beauty and bountiful consumption” they portray are achievable even to their readers (Machin and Leeuwen, 2005: 578). Using these tools, they can form and change the values of the consumers.

The concept of value is as vague and slippery as the concept of identity, and can be interpreted from several perspectives. According to Nordby (2008), values are “properties ascribed to actions we think of as ethically good or wrong” or “general concepts people believe in” (e.g. fairness, equality, justice and democracy). From a psychological perspective, values can be understood as “mental objects sharing some properties of needs, attitudes and motives in the overall meaning-based regulation in individuals”. These are e.g. personal values and ideals of an individual (Molodychenko, 2004: 9).

Lifestyle magazines both build on existing values and form new ones. As Molodychenko (2004: 7) notes, values perform two discursive functions:

- (1) instances of appraisal invoke values to legitimize a given social practice
- (2) (re)conceptualizing and (re)negotiating specific value concepts, and thus forming new values (including personal values)

As one of the most influential types of media, lifestyle magazines shape values and social identities of many people, and have the power to legitimize some social practices (p.8). A large part of lifestyle magazines is usually dedicated to advertising products, and it is therefore necessary for them to make these products seem appealing and even necessary to people. Lifestyle magazines subsequently put a lot of emphasis on social practices, such as grooming, and lead their readers to purchasing beauty products. As Carey observes, they do not question whether or not the readers really need the advertised products; they simply assume that owning such products is a necessity and the only question is what type of a specific product the reader needs.¹⁰

From this information, it is apparent that the topics of lifestyle magazines have the power to shape people’s values and subsequently influence their lives. However, there is

¹⁰ Carey, J. (1999) *The Faber Book of Utopias*. London: Faber. Cited in Hollow, 2011: 23-4.

one thing without which the content of the magazines would not have such power and persuasiveness – the specific language style of lifestyle magazines. In the next section, some of the language tools used in lifestyle magazines and their effects on readers will be introduced and shortly discussed.

4.2 Language of lifestyle magazines

As Machin and Leeuwen (2005: 579-80) assert, language itself can be one of the key carriers of meaning. When it is not formed by academics but rather by corporations trying to sell their products, the result is strikingly different. Machin and Leeuwen investigated the style of *Cosmopolitan* and described the principal styles on which the magazine draws in its different sections. It can be assumed that these will be similar for other lifestyle magazines, as their aims are alike. These styles are:

1. the style of advertising
2. the style of the fashion caption
3. the style of expert discourse
4. street style – the slang of the trendy, and the young
5. conversational style (p. 588)

As has already been mentioned, the style of advertising is not designed only to sell products, but also to influence and model the values and identities of consumer society; it has an essential role in the ‘marketization’ of discourse. As Machin and Leeuwen (2005) observe, it has three main features:

- a) the use of direct address (using *you* when addressing the reader) and imperatives to make the reader feel like the address is more personal and it is necessary to buy the product
- b) a frequent use of adjectives whose meaning is ambiguous and can be interpreted as applying both to the product and to the customer, e.g. *passion-inspiring* in:

Dramatic, passion-inspiring purple is the season’s hottest hue. To instantly make any outfit feel more ‘fall 2002’, just add a taste of plum

- c) poetic devices such as alliterations and half rhymes to make the advertisement more memorable and enjoyable:

Flaunt that gorgeous body:

A sure shot way of upping your sinister sister image is showing off that bold bod – the right way. Give up the tedious treadmill at the gym for a sexy stretchy session of yoga to attract attention to all the right places. (pp. 588-91)

The style of the fashion caption is similar to the advertising style, using all of the devices named above to attract the readers' attention and entertain them (p. 593). The style of the expert (e.g. dietician, psychologist) is more formal, it uses some technical terms (e.g. *anger management*), abstract and general nouns (e.g. *the phenomenon of gossip*), and the range of verbs is limited. Unlike in the style of the advertisement, third-person address is usually used (p. 594). The style of the street is designed to make the language of the magazine sound young and trendy, using 'street' vocabulary such as *showing off your gams* (i.e. breasts). These expressions need to be updated constantly, as they are usually short-lived. Conversational style is used in sections where the sense of informality is emphasised. It is a smart device designed to reduce the gap between the writer and the reader by using features of private speech between equals, such as deliberate errors and hesitations (p. 595).

By using language in a well-thought-out way, lifestyle magazines can influence and form people's identities and values. Some of the language devices can even have an effect on power relations within societies. As Molodychenko (2004: 15) asserts, values are invoked consistently through evaluation in the individual passages, shaping personal values of the readers. The examples above demonstrate that the language of evaluation, especially evaluative adjectives, play a large role in the effectiveness of the message.

5 Gender differences in language use

The last topic that needs to be mentioned briefly is the difference between the language of men and women. As Xia (2013: 1485) notes, “[l]anguage reflects, records and transmits social differences”, which include gender differences. It is therefore not surprising that there are certain ways in which women’s and men’s language tends to differ.

Haas (1979: 623-4) alleges that although the empirical evidence is not as strong as stereotypes, there are still some indications that men’s and women’s language differs in some respects. As she notes, men tend to use more nonstandard forms than women and adult men are generally more loquacious, assertive and directive than women. Women, on the other hand, have been found to use more emotional language. According to Lakoff, some of the typical features of female language are lexical hedges or fillers (e.g. *you know, sort of*), tag questions (e.g. *she’s very nice, isn’t she?*), intensifiers (e.g. *just, so*), ‘superpolite’ forms (e.g. indirect requests and euphemisms), and ‘empty’ adjectives (e.g. *divine, charming, cute*).¹¹ The reasons for the more frequent use of these lexical features by women is unclear – whereas some interpret them as expressing tentativeness, uncertainty and lack of confidence, some analyses have shown that they reflect the fact that women are more facilitative and supportive in conversation, and that by using these devices, they actually “express solidarity rather than insecurity” (Holmes, 2013: 303-8).

Regarding the topics of conversation, women have been found to generally put more emphasis on sharing gossip, while male groups tend to focus on “things and activities, rather than personal experiences and feelings”, putting more emphasis on facts (p. 317).

According to Xia (2013: 1486), there are some striking differences between the use of evaluative adjectives by women and men. As was already mentioned, women often tend to use adjectives such as *adorable, charming* and *lovely* while men opt for less

¹¹ Lakoff, R. (1975) *Language and Woman’s Place*. New York: Harper Colophon. Cited in Holmes, J. (2013) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 4th edn. London: Routledge, 301.

emotionally charged adjectives such as *good*. As Xia hints, this might be due to the fact that women are more likely than men to express their emotions using words.

As two of the sources cited are not contemporary, it is possible that some of the features of men's and women's language listed above have changed or are no longer valid. Nevertheless, it could be expected that some of them are still present since the process of language change is gradual.

6 Material and method

6.1 Material

The present work will examine articles from the British versions of two popular lifestyle magazines – Cosmopolitan and Esquire. Cosmopolitan is a magazine for women, covering topics such as beauty, ‘celebs’, and love; Esquire is primarily aimed at male audience and publishes articles on style, culture, news and other topics. For each of the magazines, one section from their on-line versions was chosen as a source of material for the analysis – the section *Beauty* for Cosmopolitan and *Style* for Esquire. They appeared to be the most similar ones in terms of the topics covered, with *Beauty* focusing on makeup and hair products and *Style* on clothes and accessories. The important feature these two magazine sections have in common is that they often advertise the products introduced, which will presumably reflect on their language choices and especially on the evaluative constructions used. Two sub-corpora containing articles from two magazines were then compiled, each containing approximately 121 500 word tokens.

6.2 Method

The files were part-of-speech tagged by the freeware Part-Of-Speech tagger TagAnt and examined using the corpus analysis software AntConc. In the initial part of the analysis, a list of the 100 most frequent adjectives used in each of the corpora was constructed and those with an evaluative meaning identified by inspecting the concordance lines individually. Considering that some non-evaluative adjectives can gain an evaluative meaning in certain contexts and that evaluative adjectives can be very difficult to identify, only those adjectives which are clearly evaluative in some of their meanings were listed. The reader should bear in mind that the numbers stated are only approximate, as it is almost impossible to decide how many of the meanings are evaluative and how many are not. The criteria applied when deciding if an adjective is evaluative were that it should be comparative, subjective and value-laden at least in some of its contexts. The evaluative adjectives found were sorted into sub-groups according to the type of evaluation they perform, their context and meaning was examined and

described, and, in the case of the evaluative adjectives appearing on both the lists of the most frequently occurring 100 adjectives, their use in the two corpora was compared.

In the final part of the analysis, the two corpora were scrutinized with the patterns listed in section 3.3 as a starting point. Each of the patterns was researched individually and its concordance lines examined. The aim of the analysis was to discover whether these patterns occur in the two corpora, what their uses are, if they differ in *Cosmopolitan* and *Esquire* and whether other patterns that have not been described before appear in the two magazines. Where possible, quantitative data describing the use of the patterns was given for a better comparison of the two corpora.

7 Frequency of evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire

7.1 Frequency lists and comparison

Judging by the word list in the tagged version of Cosmopolitan, adjectives are the second most frequent word class used in the magazine, with only common nouns and singular proper nouns preceding them. The frequency of occurrence of adjectives in the Cosmopolitan corpus is approximately 666 per 10 000 word tokens. Using the parameters for recognizing evaluation from the first section of the thesis, it seems that from the list of the 100 most frequent adjectives, 21 types are clearly evaluative in some of their meanings. They are: *good* <276>¹², *perfect* <82>, *great* <59>, *important* <56>, *bad* <50>, *real* <40>, *cool* <38>, *amazing* <32>, *beautiful* <31>, *easy* <29>, *big* <29>, *right* <28>, *wrong* <25>, *hard* <25>, *worth* <24>, *normal* <21>, *weird* <20>, *true* <20>, *major* <20>, *dreamy* <19>, *positive* <17>. Overall, there are 941 tokens of evaluative adjectives per 121 496 word tokens, which is approximately 77 evaluative adjectives per 10 000 word tokens.

In Esquire, adjectives are also high on the list of the most frequent word classes used, appearing in the second place behind common nouns and singular proper nouns. The frequency of adjectives in the Esquire corpus is approximately 742 per 10 000 word tokens, which is considerably higher than in Cosmopolitan. Among the most frequently used adjectives in the Esquire corpus, there is a similar number of clearly evaluative adjectives to the number found in Cosmopolitan – 24. They are *good* <154>, *great* <107>, *big* <80>, *stylish* <53>, *nice* <51>, *perfect* <45>, *important* <45>, *simple* <42>, *cool* <40>, *bad* <39>, *top* <37>, *right* <36>, *real* <35>, *smart* <34>, *beautiful* <33>, *easy* <27>, *true* <24>, *hard* <24>, *fine* <24> 930, *-dressed* (*best-dressed*, *well-dressed*, *worst-dressed*) <23>, *sharp* <20>, *interesting* <20>, *wrong* <18>, and *proper* <17>. Altogether, there are 1028 evaluative adjectives per 121 662 word tokens, which is 84 evaluative adjectives per 10 000 word tokens. Overall, there are more non-evaluative and evaluative adjectives in Esquire, although the difference is not dramatic.

¹² Numbers in angle brackets indicate the number of tokens of the adjective in the corpus.

Sub-corpus	Total nr. of adjs in sub- corpus tokens per 10,000 words	Nr. of evaluative adjs among 100 most freq. adjs - types	Nr. of evaluative adjs among 100 most freq. adjs - tokens	Nr. of evaluative adjs tokens per 10,000 words
Cosmo	666	21	941	77
Esquire	742	24	1028	84

Table 3: Number of occurrences of evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire corpora

If we compare the two lists of evaluative adjectives above, it becomes apparent that more than a half of the adjectives, namely 14, are shared by both lists. These are: *good*, *perfect*, *great*, *important*, *bad*, *real*, *cool*, *beautiful*, *easy*, *big*, *right*, *wrong*, *hard*, and *true*. Most of them seem to be quite general and probably have a high frequency in other non-specialized and informal texts, so the overlap is not very surprising. Most of the other evaluative adjectives in both lists have a more narrow meaning and could tell us more about the distinct styles and topics of the two magazines.

7.2 Evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire

In this section, the individual evaluative adjectives will be discussed in more detail. The overlapping evaluative adjectives from both lists will be examined in order to discover whether they have a similar distribution and use in the two magazines, and the remaining adjectives from both lists will be briefly discussed and compared. In order to be able to analyse the data systematically, the adjectives have been sorted into six groups, expressing emotivity (evaluating if something is good or bad), expectedness, importance, reliability (assessing if something is true or false), ease and rightness.¹³ All of these categories will be introduced and examples of sentences using each of the words presented.

¹³ This categorization is inspired by Bednarek's parameters of evaluation along chosen semantic dimensions and adapted to fit the purposes of this study. Bednarek uses the parameters of EMOTIVITY (the expression of speaker approval or disapproval), IMPORTANCE, EXPECTEDNESS, COMPREHENSIBILITY, POSSIBILITY/NECESSITY, and RELIABILITY. Bednarek, M. (2006) *Evaluation in Media Discourse*. New York: Continuum.

Emotivity	Good, perfect, great, bad, beautiful, cool, positive, <i>amazing</i> , <i>worth</i> , <i>dreamy</i> , stylish, <u>nice</u> , <u>top</u> , <u>smart</u> , <u>fine</u> , <u>(well/best/worst) dressed</u> , <u>sharp</u> , <u>interesting</u>
Expectedness	<i>Normal</i> , <i>weird</i>
Importance	Important, big, <i>major</i>
Reliability	Real, true
Ease	Easy, hard, <u>simple</u>
Rightness	Right, wrong, <u>proper</u>

Table 4: The most frequent evaluative adjectives in *Cosmopolitan* and *Esquire*¹⁴

7.2.1 Emotivity

This group expresses a positive or negative evaluation of the topic or thing discussed. It is the most numerous category, and it seems that many of the adjectives, e.g. *perfect*, *great*, *amazing*, *cool*, are used to elicit strong feelings about the topics discussed. Their emotional charge emphasises the message to make it more exciting for the readers. It is likely that the emphasis is often used to sell the products advertised by the magazines.

Good has a similar use in both the magazines. Apart from several fixed expressions, such as *a good few minutes*, it is used evaluatively. It has a general meaning, describing various topics, from beauty products to jobs, but it is most noticeably used to describe the two prevalent topics in the two magazines: skin and skin care products in *Cosmopolitan* and clothing in *Esquire*. The use in both the magazines is very similar. Interestingly, it is much more frequent in *Cosmopolitan* <276> (ex. 1a) than in *Esquire* <154> (ex. 1b).

- (1) a. *Obviously, it's good for your relationship — but it also gives your skin radiance.*
(Cosmo-2017-08-02)¹⁵
- b. *Just make sure that whoever you wear it around either has very bad vision or a good sense of humour.* (Esquire-2017-07-24)

¹⁴ The most frequent evaluative adjectives occurring on the list of top 100 adjectives only in *Cosmopolitan* are italicized, the most frequent ones only in *Esquire* are underlined.

¹⁵ The text in brackets refers to the magazine where the example is found and adduces the date of publication of the article. For readability purposes, *Cosmopolitan* will be abbreviated to *Cosmo* in these references.

The use of *perfect* is quite similar to that of *good*, often premodifying nouns denoting skin and skin care products in Cosmopolitan and clothing in Esquire. It is always evaluative in both magazines and apparently often used to make the advertised products sound appealing to the consumers. Similarly to *good*, it is used much more frequently in Cosmopolitan <82> (ex. 2a) than in Esquire <45> (ex. 2b).

- (2) a. *the pop star and future beauty guru is totally capable of busting out a perfect red carpet outfit* (Cosmo-2017-08-07)
- b. *Light, waterproof and good for keeping the wind out – perfect for the days when the weather doesn't really know what it's doing* (Esquire-2017-11-16)

Great differs from the first two adjectives in that it seems to be used more often for evaluating people and their actions and somewhat less often for advertising products. It is always evaluative in the two corpora, and is used in a wider variety of contexts than *perfect*. It appears much less frequently in Cosmopolitan <59> (ex. 3a) than in Esquire <107> (ex. 3b).

- (3) a. *Hairspray is great for keeping your hair in place, obviously.* (Cosmo-2017-10-02)
- b. *With Black Friday just two weeks away, it's a great time to get planning and acquaint yourself with the deals which- oh yes! - are already being announced.* (Esquire-2017-11-24)

Bad is always used evaluatively in the two corpora, usually describing hair dye, skin or news in Cosmopolitan, and clothes or behaviour in Esquire. It is used in quite a narrow scope of topics in both magazines, and its frequency in Cosmopolitan <50> (ex. 4a) is slightly higher than in Esquire <39> (ex. 4b).

- (4) a. *9 ways to fix a bad dye job* (Cosmo-2017-08-03)
- b. *how else can you explain the logic behind these jeans that look bad and feel awful to wear?* (Esquire-2017-07-04)

Beautiful is always evaluative in both the corpora. Similarly to *perfect* and *bad*, it is used in quite a narrow scope of contexts, with makeup products being the prevalent topic in Cosmopolitan and clothing and various items in Esquire. The number of uses in both magazines is almost identical, with <31> occurrences in Cosmopolitan (ex. 5a) and <33> in Esquire (ex. 5b). *Beautiful* is often intensified by evaluative adverbs, such as *mind-bendingly* and *undeniably*.

- (5) a. *The Catch 96 have crafted a limited edition set of GOT makeup brushes, that might just be more beautiful than that moment when Tormund first laid eyes on Brienne.* (Cosmo-2017-08-03)
- b. *Cartier's new cologne is housed in a beautiful double layered glass bottle* (Esquire-2017-12-14)

Cool is one of the more variable adjectives in terms of meaning. Although there are <38> occurrences in Cosmopolitan (ex. 6a) and <40> in Esquire (ex. 6b), the number of its evaluative uses in Cosmopolitan is considerably lower – approximately 25. The rest have the meaning of ‘cold’, usually used when writing about skin tone or makeup. In Esquire, on the other hand, all of the uses have an evaluative meaning. While the evaluative *cool* describes either beauty products or character traits in Cosmopolitan, its use in Esquire is more diverse, covering a wide variety of topics. In Esquire, *cool* is also frequently intensified by adverbs such as *incredibly* and *effortlessly*. The informal intensifier *dead* contributes to the familiar tone of evaluation expressed by the adjective *cool* in ex. 6b.

- (6) a. *I've always been pretty lazy with my hair, but now that really doesn't matter because short messy hair = instant cool girl.* (Cosmo-2017-10-04)
- b. *Dead Cool: How Come The Most Enduring Icons Of Masculine Style Are All Six Feet Under?* (Esquire-2017-07-05)

The evaluative adjectives from the emotivity group appearing on the list of the top 100 adjectives only in the Cosmopolitan corpus are: *amazing* <32>, *worth* <24>, *dreamy* <19>, and *positive* <17>.

Amazing (ex. 7a), **worth** (ex. 7b), and **dreamy** (ex. 7c) are almost always used evaluatively. *Amazing* is often intensified, usually by a superlative. All three adjectives are used in a very limited scope of contexts, usually evaluating makeup products, makeup tips and appearances. The contexts these adjectives tend to appear in suggest that they are often used to advertise products.

- (7) a. *This Instagram model has the most amazing eyebrows* (Cosmo-2017-08-07)
- b. *11 budget skincare products actually worth using* (Cosmo-2017-08-08)
- c. *The brand, which is super popular over in the US, is bursting with dreamy products* (Cosmo-2017-08-11)

Positive (ex. 8), on the other hand, is not connected with advertising but rather with evaluating something as morally good. One of its prominent uses is describing body positivity and people accepting themselves for who they really are, which is in stark contrast with all the makeup advertisements used in the magazine.

- (8) *she also happens to be one of the most body positive women in the game* (Cosmo-2017-08-17)

In the *Esquire* corpus, there are significantly more evaluative adjectives from the emotivity group appearing on the list of the top 100 adjectives. Apart from those overlapping with the evaluative adjectives from the *Cosmopolitan* corpus, they are: *stylish* <53>, *nice* <51>, *top* <37>, *smart* <34>, *fine* <24>, (*well*, *best*, *worst*) -*dressed* <23>, *sharp* <20>, and *interesting* <20>.

Stylish (ex. 9a) and **nice** (ex. 9b) are always evaluative in the *Esquire* corpus and have a similar use. They both tend to evaluate products; *nice* is almost exclusively used when describing pieces of clothing and accessories, while *stylish* also evaluates people's appearances.

- (9) a. *Ford, as we know, is a very stylish man* (Esquire-2017-07-05)
- b. *It's still a nice suit, Justin.* (Esquire-2017-11-15)

Apart from several exceptions, **smart** (ex. 10a), **fine** (ex. 10b), **sharp** (ex. 10c), and **-dressed** (ex 10d) are used evaluatively. *Smart* is usually employed in descriptions of people, appliances and clothes, *fine* in assessments of materials and products, and *sharp* often describes clothes or people's looks. There are three adjectives ending in *-dressed*: *well-dressed*, *best-dressed*, and *worst-dressed*, which always premodify the noun *man* or *men*.

- (10) a. *this smart, stylish bin takes a simple idea and makes it work beautifully* (Esquire-2017-10-23)
- b. *Since 1884, Swiss watch marque Breitling has crafted fine timepieces* (Esquire-2017-09-14)
- c. *this season, it seems like the sharp suits are giving way for bomber jackets* (Esquire-2017-12-05)
- d. *The Best Dressed Men Of The Week* (Esquire-2017-07-05)

Top (ex. 11) is usually not used in its evaluative sense, but when it is, its meaning is 'the best' or 'the most important'. It is used mostly in connection with assessments of products.

- (11) *we've asked renowned barber and men's grooming expert Carmelo Guastella to select his top products to manage and control six prevalent hair types.* (Esquire-2017-08-02)

Interesting (ex. 12) is the only adjective from this group used in a wider variety of contexts. It is always evaluative and has even ironic uses.

- (12) *David Beckham made a lot of 'interesting' outfit choices in the '90s and early noughties* (Esquire-2017-07-05)

7.2.2 Expectedness

There are only two adjectives in this category, *normal* <21> and *weird* <20>, both appearing among the top 100 adjectives used in Cosmopolitan. They both evaluate if something deviates from a norm as perceived by the creators of the magazine.

Both of the adjectives are usually evaluative, and apparently used in the sections of the magazine where products are not being advertised. *Normal* (ex. 13a) frequently appears in contexts discussing health concerns such as skin and hair issues, but also evaluates topics such as people and jobs. *Weird* (ex. 13b) is also used in a variety of contexts, none of which are predominant.

- (13) a. *But the fact is, hair loss is totally normal.* (Cosmo-2017-08-21)
 b. *The weird body part Kim Kardashian always spray tans* (Cosmo-2017-08-03)

7.2.3 Importance

There are only three evaluative adjectives in this category, two of which overlap on the two lists of the most frequent adjectives. They assess the relative importance of the things or topics discussed and have a similar representation in both magazines. They all seem to be used in various contexts in both magazines.

The number of occurrences of *important* in Cosmopolitan <56> (ex. 14a) is higher than in Esquire <45> (ex. 14b), but its use in both magazines is very similar. It is always evaluative and covers a wide range of topics. In Cosmopolitan, it is usually preceded by an adverb, such as *incredibly*; in Esquire, it is usually graded.

- (14) a. *I remind them that applying formulas at the right time is as important as choosing the right ones.* (Cosmo-2017-08-02)
 b. *For me, comfort is the most important thing.* (Esquire-2017-11-20)

Similarly to *cool*, *big* is also not primarily used for subjective evaluation, but it sometimes functions as a synonym for *important* in both corpora. Similarly to *important*, there are no predominant contexts in which it occurs. There are considerably more occurrences in Esquire <80> (ex. 15b) than in Cosmopolitan <29> (ex. 15a), and consequently more evaluative uses. In Esquire, *big* is sometimes combined with other evaluative adjectives or adjectives denoting size (e.g. *big delicious*, *big chunky*, *big and tall*), which often function as intensifiers.

- (15) a. *I wanted my hair to look it's best for the big day so decided to revisit my extensions obsession* (Cosmo-2017-08-20)
 b. *But that kind of defiant self-love is often seen as outside the bounds of mainstream masculinity—especially by big brands and ad firms wary of striking the wrong tone.* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

The only evaluative adjective from this group that appears only on one of the lists of the 100 most frequent adjectives is *major*, with <20> occurrences in Cosmopolitan (ex. 16). When used evaluatively, it is a synonym for *important*. Similarly to the two previous adjectives, it appears in various contexts.

- (16) *Has anything major recently happened in your life?* (Cosmo-2017-09-12)

7.2.4 Reliability

In this category, there only two evaluative adjectives, both of which appear on both lists of the most frequent adjectives. In their basic evaluative meaning, they assess whether something is real or fake, but acquire different meanings in certain contexts.

For the adjective *real*, it is extremely difficult to separate its evaluative from non-evaluative meanings. However, there are some clearly evaluative examples, the most striking of which are expressions such as *real people*, *real body shapes*, *real world*, which do not reflect the existence of the people and things discussed, but rather contrast ‘common’ people with celebrities or models. Cosmopolitan <40> (ex. 17a) and Esquire <35> (ex. 17b) have a similar number of occurrences of this adjective, as well as a similar range of meanings.

- (17) a. *9 tried-and-true ways real people get rid of their cystic spots* (Cosmo-2017-08-22)
Earlier this year, Dove were epically trolled for their 'real body shapes' campaign (Cosmo-2017-10-09)

b. *Kit consistently offers solid inspiration for those looking to be on-trend, but with outfits that can actually - you know - be worn in the real world* (Esquire-2017-07-21)

True in Cosmopolitan often appears in non-evaluative expressions such as *come true* and *stay true*. Most of the evaluative meanings appear in the fixed expression *tried-and-true*, meaning ‘reliable’. There are a similar number of occurrences of *true* in Esquire <24> (ex. 18b) and Cosmopolitan <20> (ex. 18a), but the pattern of use is slightly different. In Esquire, it appears more often in predicative constructions, and is subsequently more often evaluative.

- (18) a. *9 tried and true ways to get rid of cystic acne* (Cosmo-2017-09-27)
b. *Snoring: the lead cause of relationship breakdowns in the world. OK that's not true* (Esquire-2017-11-27)

7.2.5 Ease

In this category, there are three evaluative adjectives, describing the relative ease or difficulty of certain activities or things. There are no prevalent contexts in which these adjectives occur.

Easy is evaluative in almost all cases in both Cosmopolitan and Esquire. The number of occurrences is also similar, with <29> in Cosmopolitan (ex. 19a) and <27> in Esquire (ex. 19c). In Cosmopolitan, it is sometimes intensified by adverbs such as *super*, *really*, *pretty*; this almost never occurs in Esquire. In Cosmopolitan, it is frequently used to explain how easy it is to use some product, usually makeup. In Esquire, the topics are much more varied.

Hard is almost exclusively evaluative in both magazines. It has a similar number of uses, occurring <25> times in Cosmopolitan (ex. 19b) and <24> times in Esquire (ex. 19d). The variety of its contexts in Cosmopolitan is much larger than that of *easy*.

- (19) a. *The stick format means it's really easy to apply around your lip line* (Cosmo-2017-08-11)

- b. *Well as beautiful as they are, extensions can be hard work* (Cosmo-2017-08-20)
- c. *The 10 Biggest Grooming Mistakes Men Make And the easy ways to fix them* (Esquire-2017-11-16)
- d. *it is hard to find fault with his promotion of confidence and acceptance* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

Simple <42> (ex. 20) is among the top 100 adjectives in Esquire. It usually expresses subjective evaluation, often describing clothes and various items.

- (20) *we set ourselves the challenge of creating a simple, stylish and, most importantly, accessible casual outfit that can be worn (pretty much) anywhere this summer* (Esquire-2017-06-06)

7.2.6 Rightness

There are three adjectives in this category, two of which overlap on the list of the top 100 adjectives in both corpora. They are always evaluative and often assess various products.

Right occurs slightly less often in Cosmopolitan <28> (ex. 21a) than in Esquire <36> (ex. 21b). It is almost always evaluative, and belongs among the adjectives often used to comment on products, usually makeup and skin care products in Cosmopolitan, and clothes and shoes in Esquire. In Esquire, the topics are more varied than in Cosmopolitan.

- (21) a. *If you choose the right brands and you're promoting the right products that you genuinely like, it's not an issue.* (Cosmo-2017-08-30)
- b. *if you choose the right fabric and pattern it'll give life and texture to any outfit.* (Esquire-2017-12-01)

Wrong is always used evaluatively in both magazines. There are <25> occurrences in Cosmopolitan (ex. 22a) and <18> in Esquire (ex. 22b). The majority of uses in

Cosmopolitan describe wrong products or their wrong usage; in Esquire, it is usually an activity going wrong.

- (22) a. *Wearing the wrong shade or tone of foundation is a big no no.* (Cosmo-2017-09-18)
b. *It's a bit of a skill cleaning in here: she puts the vacuum cleaner on blow, which you can do, you turn it the wrong way round.* (Esquire-2017-10-10)

Proper <17> is among the top 100 adjectives used in Esquire. It usually evaluates the quality of clothes (ex. 23).

- (23) *The Best Proper Winter Coats For £200 Or Less* (Esquire-2017-11-14)

7.3 Evaluative adjectives in Cosmopolitan and Esquire – conclusion

The results of the analysis show us that the number as well as distribution and usage of evaluative adjectives is quite similar in the two magazines. A large number of the evaluative adjectives in both magazines premodify nouns denoting the things that the magazines advertise – in the case of Cosmopolitan, they are mostly makeup, skin care and hair products; in the case of Esquire, they are usually clothes and shoes. However, it seems that Esquire generally uses a wider variety of contexts and somewhat less advertisement, which reflects on the choice of evaluative adjectives, especially those from the emotivity category. In Cosmopolitan, there is a clear preference for words like *good* and *perfect*, which are usually used in contexts advertising products, while in Esquire, there is a higher number of words like *great* and *cool*, which are used in more diverse contexts.

The selection of adjectives in the two magazines confirms the results of the studies of men's and women's language – in spite of the recent tendencies to erase social differences such as class and gender, Cosmopolitan shows a clear preference for emotionally charged 'empty' adjectives such as *perfect*, *amazing* and *dreamy*, while the most frequently used adjectives in Esquire, e.g. *great*, *cool*, *stylish*, *nice*, usually convey somewhat less emotion. It is worth noting that both of the adjectives from the

‘expectedness’ group, *normal* and *weird*, are frequent only in Cosmopolitan, which could be explained by women’s potential attraction to gossip, as some of the sentences express the opinions of the author rather than facts. Lastly, it seems that the two magazines differ slightly in the use of intensifiers – whereas Esquire often employs adverbials and reduplication, Cosmopolitan appears to have a preference for superlatives before certain evaluative adjectives.

8 Evaluative patterns in Cosmopolitan and Esquire

8.1 *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated)

The first pattern has quite a large number of occurrences in both corpora, but its use in Cosmopolitan <63> is significantly more frequent than in Esquire <30>. It seems that the adjectives in this pattern are always evaluative, the majority in their primary meaning. The most frequent adjective used in this pattern in the Cosmopolitan corpus is *important*, with <15> occurrences (ex. 24a), followed by *good* <5>, *hard* <5>, *worth* <4>, *clear* <4> (ex. 24b), *OK/okay* <3>, and *frustrating* <3>. Other adjectives include *unlikely*, *impossible*, *pointless*, *cool*, *quick and easy*, *sad*, *reassuring*, *crucial*, *inspiring*, *common sense*, *fair*, *imperative*, *risky*, *crazy*, *weird*, and *nice*.

- (24) a. *So if you are losing strands, it's important not to freak out, your mane will recover.* (Cosmo-2017-08-21)
b. *it's clear from the backstage beauty snaps that the Waterweight Concealer is going to be a winner...* (Cosmo-2017-09-25)

The list of the most frequent adjectives used in this pattern in the Esquire corpus differs slightly. *Hard* is the most prominent of them, with <5> occurrences (ex. 25a), followed by *possible* <4> (ex. 25b), *easy* <4>, and *important* <3>. Other adjectives include *okay*, *clear/unclear*, *nice*, *perfect*, *true*, *arguable*, *difficult*, *boorish*, and *amazing*.

- (25) a. *it's hard to imagine any of them reaching the quasi-religious level of iconhood that Kurt did* (Esquire-2017-07-20)
b. *It's possible that this moment launched the unsightly trend for navel-skimming V-neck T-shirts* (Esquire-2017-08-10)

From these examples, it is apparent that whereas in Cosmopolitan, this pattern is employed mainly to assess the importance of the events or situations discussed, Esquire puts more focus on their relative ease/difficulty or possibility. The adjectives used in this

pattern in the Cosmopolitan corpus are sometimes intensified by adverbs such as *really*, *so*, *quite* (ex. 26), and *totally*, which never occurs in the Esquire corpus.

(26) *So it's quite hard to imagine not having it there.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-30)

The only link verb represented in the Cosmopolitan corpus is *be* in various tenses. In Esquire, *be* is also the most frequent link verb, but there are also three occurrences of *seems* (ex. 27), which seems to be used when trying to sound less direct or to soften the impact of the claim.

(27) *It seems boorish after all to sully that greenery with exhaust fumes.* (Esquire-2017-10-20)

In this pattern, the thing evaluated is realized by an extraposed subject finite or non-finite clause, usually introduced by *to* or *that*. Infinitive clauses, introduced by *to* or *not to* are the most frequent type in Cosmopolitan (38 instances, ex. 24a), followed by *that*-clauses (14 instances, ex. 28a). In several of the *that*-clauses, *that* is ellipped (ex. 28b). Five of the declarative content clauses are asyndetic (ex. 29). The rest of the finite/non-finite clauses in the Cosmopolitan corpus are introduced by *when* (ex. 30a), *if*, and *how* (ex. 30b).

(28) a. *it's reassuring that in another way she's like all mere mortals* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-15)

b. *it's important you nail down the style you want* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-08)

(29) a. *it's worth going off-grid in terms of how you use your beauty essentials* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-02)

(30) a. *It's so frustrating when you see reality TV stars or celebrities not disclosing sponsored posts* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-30)

b. *It's sad how people feel the need to apologize for EVERYTHING.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-09)

The situation in *Esquire* is quite similar, with <24> of the finite/non-finite clauses introduced by *to* or *not to* (ex. 31a), and <5> by *that* (ex. 31b). In the remaining sentence, *how* is used.

- (31) a. *It's difficult to take their brain seriously; they've worn such a silly garment.*
(*Esquire*-2017-10-10)
- b. *it's arguable that Apple's technique of pressing an external button [...] is an easier, more subtle way to connect to the emergency services* (*Esquire*-2017-09-25)

Overall, it seems that there is a difference in the type of modality that the different types of clauses in this pattern denote – while the *to*-infinitive clauses usually convey dispositional modality and focus on actions or mental processes, the *that*-clauses express epistemic modality.

8.2 *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge)+ ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated)

Compared to the previous one, this pattern is not very frequent in the two corpora, with 3 occurrences in *Cosmopolitan* and 4 in *Esquire*. Although it is difficult to draw conclusions from so few examples, there are some points worth noting. All of the instances in *Esquire* begin with *there* and include the hinge *about*. Of the four adjectives used in the pattern in *Esquire*, two are clearly evaluative (*starry*, *reassuring* - ex. 32a) and two have a non-evaluative primary meaning which changes when used in the pattern. Incorruptibility does not seem to be a matter of subjective evaluation, but in this context, it is used in the description of someone's character traits and probably has an aspect of positive evaluation of the person described (ex. 32b). The adjective *new* on its own is also not evaluative, but in this pattern, it gains the meaning of 'surprising' (ex. 32c). Although it might not always be completely transparent, there is an element of subjective evaluation in all of the examples. Two of the things evaluated are represented by a pronoun and two by a noun in the *Esquire* sentences.

- (32) a. *There is something reassuring about a beautifully-made watch.* (Esquire-2017-10-30)
 b. *She is happy for the help but there is something incorruptible about her.* (Esquire-2017-07-03)
 c. *There's nothing new about men in jewellery.* (Esquire-2017-08-10)

The three occurrences of this pattern found in Cosmopolitan are quite different. None of them begins with *there*, but all are clearly variations of this pattern. The substitutes for *there* are *I don't see* (ex. 33a), *ain't* (ex. 33b), and a pattern without *there* beginning with *something* (ex. 33c). The adjective used in all of these sentences is *wrong*, which is always used to give subjective judgement, expressing whether the thing/person evaluated is good or bad, and is always followed by the preposition *with*, which does not occur in the pattern originally identified by Bednarek. The thing evaluated is expressed by a pronoun in all the Cosmopolitan examples.

- (33) a. *I don't see anything wrong with this.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-09)
 b. *in loving memory of finn wolfhard, ain't nothing wrong with him, i just love remembering him* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-10)
 c. *if you dare have a spot or a breakout—and if you dare to take a picture of it—it's almost like something's wrong with you, which is so false* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-03)

8.3 Patterns with link verb and *to*-infinitive clause

The third pattern is quite frequent in the two corpora, with a slightly higher number of occurrences in the Cosmopolitan corpus than in Esquire. The pattern is not always evaluative as it includes many fixed and other expressions not necessarily carrying an evaluative meaning (e.g. *be able/willing to*, *she is good to go* etc.). After excluding all such sentences, the number of occurrences of this pattern is <24> in Cosmopolitan and <18> in Esquire. There are many different adjectives used in this pattern which can be divided into three groups, denoting direct evaluation, personal response of a thing or person, or the likelihood of something happening (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 87). Each of these groups attracts a different semantic group of adjectives. In Cosmopolitan, the

number of instances of this pattern used as a personal response and as a direct evaluation is even, with <10> sentences for each type. The most frequent adjectives denoting a personal response are *happy* <3> (ex. 34a) and *afraid* <3> (ex. 34b), followed by *busy*, *curious*, *grateful*, and *desperate*. From this list, it seems that this pattern is usually used to express evaluating response, describing intense positive as well as negative emotions and mental states in Cosmopolitan. The subject of the sentence is usually an evaluator and is animate. In this respect, the use of this pattern is the same in Esquire.

- (34) a. *We had a giggle about it, and she seemed happy to follow my advice!*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-02)
- b. *clearly this show isn't afraid to shy away from incest* (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-04)

The most frequent adjectives from the group expressing direct evaluation in Cosmopolitan are *easy* <2> and *difficult* <2> (ex. 35a), followed by *perfect* (ex. 35b), *stubborn and difficult*, *hard*, *long enough*, *lazy*, and *soft and easy*. Apparently, direct evaluation in combination with this pattern tends to be used to assess the relative ease or difficulty of some activity in Cosmopolitan, but has a variety of other meanings as well. In this group, the adjective used is the evaluative category and the subject the thing evaluated. The third group, assessing the likelihood of something happening, is not very diverse in the Cosmopolitan corpus, using only one adjective - *likely* - and with only 4 occurrences (ex. 35c).

- (35) a. *The perfume is still difficult to get hold of, but you can currently get the vaporiser on eBay.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-07)
- b. *this fold up version is perfect to chuck in my handbag.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-04)
- c. *each hair will be cut at a sharper angle, and is therefore more likely to grow back under the skin.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-29)

The adjectives from this pattern are sometimes intensified in Cosmopolitan, e.g. by *too*, *more than* (ex. 36a), and *particularly* (ex. 36b).

- (36) a. *I'm more than happy to talk about being pregnant* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-30)
 b. *orange tones can be particularly stubborn and difficult to deal with*
 (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-21)

The situation in Esquire is quite similar, with 7 occurrences for each of the categories of personal response and direct evaluation. The most frequently used adjective from the group of personal response is *eager* <2>, followed by *glad*, *anxious* (ex. 37a), *proud*, *resistant*, and *thrilled* (ex. 37b). The adjectives from this group seem to be somewhat less varied in terms of positive and negative emotions than those used in Cosmopolitan, with the majority expressing positive emotions.

- (37) a. *designers don't think in words, they are anxious to promote their brands*
 (Esquire-2017-07-03)
 b. *he is thrilled by the mainstreaming of plus-size men but is eager to see diversity in size but also in race* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

From the group of direct evaluation, the most frequent adjectives in the Esquire corpus are *tricky* <2> (ex. 38a) and *hard* <2>, followed by *easy* (ex. 38b), *costly*, and *good*. There is less variety in this group than in the group denoting direct evaluation in Cosmopolitan, but the two most frequent adjectives also express the difficulty of some actions.

- (38) a. *They can be tricky to get the best out of, often need extra attention and looking after* (Esquire-2017-11-14)
 b. *Wireless in-ears like Apple's AirPods are a Marmite proposition – yes, they do look easy to lose* (Esquire-2017-09-18)

The third group, assessing the likelihood of something happening, appears relatively more frequently in the Esquire corpus than in Cosmopolitan and the adjectives are also more variable – there are 5 occurrences of this group and the adjectives used are *likely/unlikely* (ex. 39a) and *sure* (ex. 39b).

- (39) a. *Bose's noise-cancelling headphones are not cheap but are unlikely to disappoint.* (Esquire-2017-08-31)

b. *But, if Samsung can do it (who happen to supply the iPhone 8's OLED screen), Apple is sure to make a good crack at it too.* (Esquire-2017-08-31)

Similarly to Cosmopolitan, there is also some intensification of the adjectives used in this pattern in the Esquire corpus, but the adverbs used are different: *really* (ex. 40a) and *very* (ex. 40b).

- (40) a. *We were really eager to start showing some ideas on how people can wear suits or jackets without it feeling boring.* (Esquire-2017-11-15)
b. *you have to get your picture lined up really well because you only have 24 exposures, or 36, and they're very costly to print* (Esquire-2017-11-19)

An interesting point about this pattern is the relationship between the subject of the main clause and the verb in the *to*-infinitive clause. In both corpora, there are sentences in which the subject of the main clause functions as the subject of the *to*-infinitive clause and others where it functions as its object, which is illustrated by the last two examples from Esquire (ex. 40a-b). The pattern in which the subject of the first clause functions as the object of the *to*-infinitive clause can be paraphrased by using anticipatory *it*, e.g. *it is very costly to print them*, which corresponds to the pattern *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated).

8.4 Patterns with link verb and *that*-clause

Unfortunately, it seems impossible to identify all sentences using this pattern, since *that* in *that*-clauses is sometimes omitted. It appears that the best solution is to identify only the patterns using *that* and describe their use, risking that the results of the analysis might be different if all the uses of this pattern were identified. In the two corpora, there are not many occurrences of these patterns - <7> in Esquire and <4> in Cosmopolitan. The vast majority of the subjects in the sentences using this pattern in both corpora are expressed by pronouns. The adjectives are not very diverse, all of them describing mental states (evaluating response) of the subject of the sentence, which is always a person (evaluator). They can be divided into four groups, expressing: the degree of certainty or

awareness of something, someone's attitude towards the future, a personal reaction to a state of affairs, and seeing something as desirable or undesirable (Hunston and Sinclair, 2000: 88-9). In each of the magazines, only three of these groups are represented. In Cosmopolitan, the degree of certainty or awareness of something appears in two sentences, both of which use the adjective *aware* (ex. 41).

- (41) *I'm fully aware that I have what can only be described as a problem.*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-08)

The remaining two adjectives convey somebody's attitude towards the future and a personal reaction to a state of affairs, expressed by the adjectives *hopeful* (ex. 42a) and *relieved* (ex. 42b).

- (42) a. *I found myself slathering this all over my upper body and dabbing a small amount onto my temples - hopeful that it just might do the trick* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-10)
b. *I actually feel kind of relieved that I've finally broken my attachment to long hair.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-04)

The most numerous category appearing in the Esquire corpus is expressing attitude towards the future. It appears in four sentences, three of which use the adjective *afraid* (ex. 43a); the adjective in the last sentence is *optimistic* (ex. 43b).

- (43) a. *brands are afraid that these changes will make their products undesirable* (Esquire-2017-06-26)
b. *He's eager to be part of the change, and he is optimistic that the industry is starting to grow.* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

The second most frequently used category in the Esquire corpus is someone's degree of certainty or awareness of something, with two adjectives: *aware* (ex. 44a) and *certain*. The remaining category expresses whether something is desirable or undesirable, employing the adjective *lucky* (ex. 44b).

- (44) a. *Miko is well aware that not every plus-size guy will see themselves in him*
(Esquire-2017-07-25)
- b. *We're lucky that we have access to an almost infinite library of stylish men from the last century and beyond to take inspiration from.* (Esquire-2017-10-11)

The adjectives in these patterns are sometimes intensified, especially in Cosmopolitan where intensification occurs in three out of four sentences. The intensifiers are *well*, *fully*, and *kind of*.

8.5 Patterns with general nouns

Due to the large number of occurrences of general nouns in the two corpora, it would be impossible to study the uses of each of them, and therefore we will focus only on the noun *thing* which is the most frequently used one and creates most patterns. Using the three patterns found by Bednarek as a starting point, the general uses of the noun *thing* were studied. Since the expression *do the decent thing* does not appear in either of the corpora, the only two patterns left to examine were:

- NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category)
- NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category) + PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE (evaluating context) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated).

When researching the contexts in which the general noun *thing* was used, one more pattern was found:

- NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* + LINK VERB (hinge) + *TO*-INFINITIVE CLAUSE/*THAT*-CLAUSE (thing evaluated).

In Cosmopolitan, there are <13> occurrences of these patterns overall, which is a significantly smaller number than in Esquire <22>.

The first pattern, NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category), is the most frequent one overall, although it has much fewer occurrences in Cosmopolitan <3> than in Esquire <16>. The three Cosmopolitan examples are quite varied, expressing different kinds of evaluation. Only one of the occurrences of *thing* is premodified (ex. 45a) and the others use postmodification which never occurs in the Esquire corpus in this pattern. Neither of the sentences with postmodification uses an adjective – the expression *thing to do* (ex. 45b) expresses the advisability of doing something by an infinitive; *a thing of beauty* (ex. 45c) could be paraphrased by a premodifying *beautiful*, but in this use, it seems to emphasise the evaluation even more.

- (45) a. *Ever wonder if it's a coincidence that when you're hormonal you break out with a juicy second head on your chin (the last thing you need at that time of month)?*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-25)
- b. *having a super light under-eye was the thing to do and I absolutely loved it at the time* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-16)
- c. *Harry Potter themed make up now exists and it's a thing of beauty.*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-30)

The situation in Esquire is quite different, with the majority of the occurrences of *thing* in this pattern behaving quite regularly. They are always premodified, do not express a wide variety of types of evaluation, and often occur in copular predication. The most frequently used adjective premodifying *thing* is *important* <6> (ex. 46a), followed, by *good* <2> (ex. 46b) and *easiest* <2>; the other adjectives include *big*, *dreaded*, *staidest*, *wonderful*, *bad*, *normal*, and *coolest*.

- (46) a. *For me, comfort is the most important thing.* (Esquire-2017-11-20)
- b. *[W]e have no computer. I'm not saying it's a good thing or a bad thing, we just don't.* (Esquire-2017-11-19)

In Esquire, *thing* in this pattern is often intensified by superlatives, but also adverbials following the general noun preceded by a superlative. The most frequent intensifying adverbial is *in the world* <3> (ex. 47).

(47) *DB makes it look like the easiest thing in the world.* (Esquire-2017-09-11)

The pattern NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* (evaluative category) + PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE (evaluating context) + LINK VERB (hinge) + NOUN GROUP (thing evaluated) is less frequent, with <5> occurrences in Cosmopolitan and <4> in Esquire. All the examples in both corpora fit Bednarek's pattern clearly. In Cosmopolitan, four of them express the emotivity type of evaluation, using the adjectives *best* (ex. 48a), *worst* and *great*, all of which are followed by *about*, which precedes the thing evaluated. The only example from a different evaluative category is the one using the adjective *important* (ex. 48b); it is also the only one that uses the preposition *for*, followed by a noun that is not being evaluated.

- (48) a. *The best thing about this combo is that I can use them every day without worrying about product build-up or over-cleansing.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-07)
b. *The most important thing for my clients is that I'm making sure that I'm not hurting their skin* (Cosmopolitan-2017-10-05)

In the Esquire corpus, two of the adjectives express the emotivity type of evaluation, and the other two the desirability of the situation and the relative importance. Similarly to the examples from Cosmopolitan, the adjectives expressing emotivity evaluation (*brilliant* – ex. 49a, *nice*) are followed by the preposition *about*, and the adjectives describing desirability (*lucky* – ex. 49b) and importance (*main*) by *for*.

- (49) a. *The brilliant thing about Prince Charles is the way he never follows trends, but still manages to look so stylish* (Esquire-2017-08-09)
b. *The lucky thing for me is that I have an eye for it* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

The group of sentences with general *thing* which do not fit into any of the patterns identified by Bednarek can be summarized by the pattern NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* + LINK VERB (hinge) + *TO*-INFINITIVE CLAUSE/*THAT*-CLAUSE (thing evaluated), with <5> occurrences in the Cosmopolitan corpus and <2> in the Esquire corpus. In Cosmopolitan, it behaves similarly to the first pattern in Esquire - the adjectives always

premodify the general noun and express the evaluation of goodness/badness or importance; the examples assessing importance are intensified (ex. 50).

- (50) *The best thing is that they require very little maintenance for 6-8 weeks*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-08)

Although the general noun *thing* occurs in the Esquire corpus much more frequently than in Cosmopolitan, there are only two occurrences of the last pattern, the adjectives used evaluating the goodness/badness and importance (ex. 51).

- (51) *The most important thing to remember is that you need to feel relaxed and confident in a hat* (Esquire-2017-06-23)

8.6 Adjective complementation

Due to the very high frequency of occurrence of the pattern NOUN GROUP + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP + PP in the two corpora, a precise quantitative analysis is not possible in this case. Nevertheless, some conclusions about its use in the two magazines can still be drawn. Both of the patterns identified by Bednarek occur in the two corpora. They are:

A: *Evaluator + Evaluating response + Thing evaluated*

B: *Thing evaluated + Evaluative category + Restriction on evaluation*

In the Cosmopolitan corpus, the majority of occurrences of this pattern are not evaluative, but there are still a large number of evaluative uses, most of which correspond to pattern B. It seems that this pattern usually expresses whether something is good or bad, often using adjectives such as *good*, *perfect* (ex. 52a), *great* (ex. 52b) and *gorgeous*. Other adjectives include *dangerous*, *gentle*, *helpful* etc.

- (52) a. *it's is perfect for on-the-go spritzing as well as a permanent dressing table must-have.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-21)

b. *If anything, he looks great in his white jumpsuit and...* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-09)

Pattern A includes a wide variety of adjectives which usually express emotions. The adjectives used include *happy*, *excited* (ex. 53a), *sorry*, *naive*, *embarrassed* (ex. 53b).

- (53) a. *However, before you get too excited about this miracle drug, the side effects can also be downright terrible.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-01)
b. *a lot of clients feel embarrassed about having not shaved their legs or having rough feet or something* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-23)

The prepositions appearing in these two patterns in the Cosmopolitan corpus do not seem to be very varied, with the most frequent one apparently being *for*, expressing the restriction on evaluation. It appears that in the vast majority of cases, it is connected with evaluating whether something is good or bad, often following the adjectives *good*, *great*, *perfect* etc. The other prepositions are *about*, *with*, *in*, *on*, and *at*. *About* and *with* tend to occur in pattern A which often expresses emotions, appearing in constructions such as *excited about*, *feel good about*, *happy with* etc. The subject in this pattern is the evaluator and the prepositional phrase the thing evaluated. *On* and *at* do not have many occurrences; they usually form pattern B and some of the examples of their use are *are great on* (ex. 54a) and *pretty terrible at* (ex. 54b). In these cases, the subject is the thing evaluated and the prepositional phrase the restriction on evaluation.

- (54) a. *Berry tones with a blue base are great on the cooler fair complexion* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-21)
b. *Kimmy is actually pretty terrible at her own makeup* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-03)

Similarly to the Cosmopolitan corpus, there are many occurrences of these patterns in Esquire, usually not evaluative, but still with a large number of evaluative uses. The numbers of occurrences of the two patterns seems to be more equal than in Cosmopolitan. Similarly to Cosmopolitan, the adjectives used in pattern B are not very varied, with the majority evaluating whether something is good or bad. The most frequently occurring

adjectives in this pattern are *perfect*, *great*, and *good* (ex. 55a); other examples include *brilliant* (ex. 55b), *unique*, *cool*, *ideal*.

- (55) a. *As Wordsworth and his Romantic #squad knew, what's green is good for the soul.* (Esquire-2017-10-20)
b. *COS is brilliant for basics, so just keep that in mind.* (Esquire-2017-06-06)

Pattern A seems to appear more frequently in the Esquire corpus than in Cosmopolitan. A frequently occurring adjective in this pattern *sick* in the meaning of ‘fed up’ (ex. 56a); other adjectives include *confident*, *weary*, *fine*, *proud* (ex. 56b), *happy*. The use of this pattern is very similar in both magazines, normally describing emotions.

- (56) a. *But trust us: they are sick and tired of seeing every pumped crevice of your over-worked bottom half.* (Esquire-2017-07-04)
b. *David Beckham Just Pulled Off The Trickiest (And Most Maligned) Accessory In Menswear And we are all very proud of him* (Esquire-2017-06-23)

Similarly to the Cosmopolitan corpus, the most frequent preposition used in the Esquire sentences seems to be *for*, closely followed by *in*. They both tend to be used in pattern B, following adjectives such as *perfect*, *good*, *great*. These prepositions introduce the restriction on evaluation. Another frequent preposition in the Esquire corpus is *of*, usually used in pattern A. It follows adjectives such as *sick*, *weary*, *proud*, *tired* and introduces the thing evaluated. Some of the less frequently used prepositions include *with*, *on* (ex. 57a), and *about*; the first two tend to occur in pattern B, and *about* (ex. 57b) in pattern A.

- (57) a. *They look great on girls. And that's reason enough to steer well clear.* (Esquire-2017-06-13)
b. *We're not sure about you* (Esquire-2017-07-13)

8.7 Graded adjectives

Similarly to the previous pattern, there are so many occurrences of graded adjectives in the two corpora that it is impossible to use quantitative research. These patterns include comparative and superlative adjectives, adjectives with *too* and *enough*, and the pattern *SOMETHING AS + ADJECTIVE GROUP + AS + NOUN GROUP*.

8.7.1 Comparative and superlative adjectives

In the Cosmopolitan corpus, comparative adjectives do not commonly appear in evaluative constructions. When they do, they usually evaluate whether something is good or bad, the most frequently occurring adjectives being *better* and *worse* (ex. 58a). Other adjectives include *easier* (ex. 58b), *more graceful*, *prettier*, *greater*. There are no specific patterns that comparative adjectives appear in.

- (58) a. *To make matters worse for ABH, Jeffree Star posted his review of the palette*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-08-02)
- b. *If you want a thorough wax like a Brazilian or Hollywood the therapist may find it easier if you remove your pants or offer you some disposable pants instead.*
(Cosmopolitan-2017-09-01)

In Esquire, comparative adjectives also do not usually appear in evaluative constructions. It seems that the majority of evaluative uses express the emotivity type of evaluation, with the most frequently used adjectives being *better* and *worse*. Other examples include *easier* (ex. 59a), *simpler*, *braver*, *cooler* (ex. 59b).

- (59) a. *pressing an external button five times in quick succession is an easier, more subtle way to connect to the emergency services* (Esquire-2017-09-25)
- b. *Coates researched the market and started a massive outreach effort, getting insight from the men who'd been asking him for years what they could do to look cooler.* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

In Cosmopolitan, the use of superlative adjectives in evaluative constructions is much more frequent than that of comparative adjectives. They have a number of different uses, usually describing some products, and it seems that their purpose is often to excite potential customers about the items advertised. Similarly to comparative adjectives, the most frequent type of evaluation is apparently the emotivity evaluation, with many uses of words such as *best*, *worst*, *coolest*, and *cutest* (ex. 60a). Other adjectives include *the most amazing* (ex. 60b), *simplest*, *biggest* (in importance), *craziest*, *prettiest*, *highest quality* etc.

- (60) a. *How to get the cutest rainbow heart braids* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-07)
 b. *The "most amazing matte bright red orange statement lip"* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-16)

Superlative adjectives seem to be used rather less often in Esquire than in Cosmopolitan, but they also do not occur in any specific patterns and the evaluation they express is usually of the emotivity type. The most frequently used adjective is *best*, followed by *finest*, *funniest*, *weirdest*, *hottest*, *biggest* (in importance), *plainest*, *most annoying* (ex. 61a), *sharpest* (ex. 61b), etc. The meaning is often intensified by adverbials.

- (61) a. *The 10 Most Annoying TED Talks Of All-Time* (Esquire-2017-10-31)
 b. *One of the sharpest dressers in the world of sport* (Esquire-2017-07-12)

8.7.2 ADJECTIVE GROUP + ENOUGH

This pattern is quite rare in the Cosmopolitan corpus, but variable, denoting different types of evaluation and used in diverse contexts. Some of the adjectives used in this pattern include *lucky* (ex. 62a), *cool*, *good*, *traumatic* (ex. 62b), *creepy*.

- (62) a. *I was lucky enough to be named her Maid of Honour.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-20)
 b. *As if the process of ripping hairs from your body with sticky hot wax wasn't traumatic enough, one woman had what can only be described as a hellish experience with some Boots DIY wax strips.* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-31)

It appears that this construction is used slightly more often in Esquire than in Cosmopolitan. Although the contexts and types of evaluation vary, there seems to be a clear preference for the emotivity type of evaluation in this pattern in the Esquire corpus. Adjectives used include *good*, *cool*, *nice*, *interesting* (ex. 63a), *smart*, *savvy* (ex. 63b), *versatile*.

- (63) a. *It's not even interesting enough to be fugly.* (Esquire-2017-09-22)
 b. *People are just playing at the seams of the all this and brands are savvy enough to notice.* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

It appears that there are two variants of this pattern: ADJECTIVE GROUP + *ENOUGH*, and ADJECTIVE GROUP + *ENOUGH* + TO-INFINITIVE. The infinitive construction usually functions as a restriction on evaluation.

8.7.3 *TOO* + ADJECTIVE GROUP

In the Cosmopolitan corpus, *too* has several different uses with different meanings, some of which seem to have become fixed expressions in the language of lifestyle magazines – notably, these phrases are employed when describing various products (e.g. *before you get too excited*, *it's never too early for/to* – ex. 64a). Other uses involve descriptions of character traits and states or actions (e.g. *too lazy* – ex. 64b, *busy*) and of the relative difficulty of an activity (*too hard*). Overall, there are a wide variety of uses of *too* involving evaluation in the Cosmopolitan corpus and the patterns cannot be neatly categorized. If the adjective group is followed by a preposition or infinitive construction, it often introduces a restriction on evaluation (ex. 64a, b).

- (64) a. *I know what you're thinking, but it's never too early for Christmas-themed bath products—OK?* (Cosmopolitan-2017-08-10)
 b. *I have a natural wave and I'm too lazy to put on a full face of make-up every day anyway* (Cosmopolitan-2017-09-07)

The adjectives used in patterns with *too* in the Esquire corpus are not very variable. A large number of them describes the size, height or length of something (e.g. *too long*,

too short, too high). Other uses involve descriptions of price (*too cheap, too expensive*) and several other meanings, e.g. *too soft* (ex. 65a). In the Esquire corpus, *too* sometimes appears in the construction *TOO* + ADJECTIVE GROUP + *TO* + LINK VERB + NOUN GROUP/ADJECTIVE GROUP (ex. 65b).

- (65) a. *To wake up in a bed that is far too soft and realise at the breaking of each new day that you are Piers Morgan, now and forever.* (Esquire-2017-07-13)
 b. *Directors repeatedly told him he was too big to be a leading man* (Esquire-2017-07-25)

8.7.4 *SOMETHING AS* + ADJECTIVE GROUP + *AS* + NOUN GROUP

This pattern does not have any occurrences in the Cosmopolitan corpus and is used only once in the Esquire corpus. Although the adjective *un-synthetic* (ex. 66) does not primarily express evaluation, it seems to gain a positive connotation in this sentence.

- (66) *modern day parkas are available in all manner of fabrics, but in our opinion you're best off opting for something as un-synthetic as possible* (Esquire-2017-11-16)

8.8 Predicative adjective patterns

The last group of patterns identified by Bednarek seems to be quite vague – predication is one of the basic constructions in which almost all adjectives can occur. Unlike the other patterns introduced, the predicative use of an adjective does not constitute its evaluative function, since predication itself cannot lend an adjective a different meaning than it already possesses. For this reason, it seems unnecessary to analyse the predicative use of adjectives.

8.9 Evaluative patterns in Cosmopolitan and Esquire – conclusion

To sum up, the number of occurrences of the first pattern, *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing

evaluated) is significantly higher in the Cosmopolitan corpus than in Esquire, most often evaluating the relative importance of a thing or activity in Cosmopolitan and difficulty or possibility in Esquire. In Cosmopolitan, the adjectives in this pattern are sometimes intensified. In the vast majority of cases in both magazines, the link verb used in this pattern is *be* in various tenses, but there are also several occurrences of *seem* in Esquire. The clause representing the thing evaluated is introduced by *to*, *not to* or *that* in the majority of cases in both corpora. Other ways to introduce it include the use of a gerund after certain adjectives and the conjunctions *when*, *if* and *how*.

The second pattern, *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge) + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated) does not appear frequently in either of the corpora. The sentences corresponding to the pattern in the Esquire corpus are quite regular, always beginning with *there* and with the preposition *about* following the evaluative adjective, whereas all of the Cosmopolitan sentences represent different variations of the pattern. The only adjective used in the Cosmopolitan examples is *wrong*, which is clearly evaluative in its primary sense; the adjectives used in the Esquire sentences are more variable and some of them gain an evaluative meaning only in combination with the pattern. While the *to*-infinitive clauses usually convey dispositional modality, the *that*-clauses are used to express epistemic modality.

The use of patterns with link verb and *to*-infinitive clause in the two corpora seems to be quite similar in the number of occurrences as well as range of uses. The groups expressing direct evaluation and personal response of a thing or person in both corpora are more numerous than the group assessing the likelihood of something happening. The adjectives in the sentences denoting personal response usually express emotions while those from the group of direct evaluation often assess the relative ease of some activity. The adjectives in this pattern are sometimes intensified in both corpora.

Only several examples of patterns with link verb and *that*-clause were found in the two corpora, the majority from the group expressing the degree of certainty or awareness of something in Cosmopolitan and from the group denoting attitudes towards the future in Esquire. Sometimes, intensification appears in this pattern, especially in the Cosmopolitan sentences. There do not seem to be any striking differences between the use and distribution of these patterns in the two magazines.

Patterns using the general noun *thing* occur much less frequently in the Cosmopolitan corpus than in Esquire. Of the three patterns identified by Bednarek, only two were found in the corpora, but a new one was discovered. There is an interesting dissimilarity between the two corpora in the distribution of the patterns – the first one, which is the most numerous in Esquire and behaves predictably in the magazine, has very few occurrences in Cosmopolitan, and these do not show any regularity in terms of their sentence structure or type of evaluation. The use and structure of the second pattern is quite similar in both corpora, often evaluating whether something is good or important. The newly identified pattern occurs more often in Cosmopolitan, showing a similar behaviour to the first pattern used in Esquire.

There is a large number of occurrences of patterns with adjective complementation in both magazines and they usually do not involve evaluation. Pattern B (Thing evaluated + Evaluating category + Restriction on evaluation) seems to be the more frequently used one, normally evaluating whether something is good or bad, whereas pattern A (Evaluator + Evaluating response + Thing evaluated) often employs evaluative adjectives denoting emotional states. The prepositions *for*, *in*, *with*, and *on* tend to occur in pattern B; *of*, *about* and *with* are most often connected with pattern A.

A number of patterns belong in the last group – comparative and superlative adjectives, patterns with *enough* and *too*, and the pattern *SOMETHING AS + ADJECTIVE GROUP + AS + NOUN GROUP*. Comparative adjectives are not often used evaluatively in the two corpora, but when they are, they usually describe whether something is good or bad. Superlative adjectives also typically express the emotivity type of evaluation, but occur more frequently in evaluative constructions. Both comparative and superlative adjectives appear in a number of patterns which are impossible to neatly categorize. The pattern with *enough* seems to be used more frequently in Esquire, and unlike in Cosmopolitan, there is a clear preference for one type of evaluation, assessing if something is good or bad. The behaviour of patterns with *too* differs in the two corpora – whereas it employs a variety of different adjectives and types of evaluation in Cosmopolitan, the occurrences in Esquire are quite monotonous, usually describing the size, height or length of something or somebody.

9 Conclusion

The present study revealed that evaluative adjectival patterns are a tool frequently used in lifestyle magazines – overall, adjectives are the second most numerous word class employed in both *Cosmopolitan* and *Esquire*, with even more occurrences than verbs. Although the use of many of the adjectives is very similar, a number of striking differences have been revealed between the use of evaluative adjectives and adjectival evaluative patterns in *Cosmopolitan* and *Esquire*.

Firstly, the magazines differ in the frequency and distribution of adjectives denoting ‘emotivity’ – while those expressing strong emotion (e.g. *amazing*, *perfect*) in the emotivity type of evaluation occur very frequently in the magazine for women, the magazine for men tends to opt for somewhat less emotionally charged evaluative adjectives (e.g. *great*, *cool*). An interesting discovery was that the ‘emotive’ adjectives are frequently employed in passages advertising products, while the more ‘restrained’ adjectives usually appear in more diverse contexts, focusing somewhat less on advertising and more on descriptions of various other topics and activities. Consequently, it appears that, at least in the articles analysed, *Cosmopolitan* puts more emphasis on advertising products than *Esquire*, although advertisement is also a big part of the content of the *Esquire* articles. Using emotionally charged adjectives seems to be an effective way to promote and sell various products.

Secondly, the ‘expectedness’ category is the only one containing evaluative adjectives which occur only on one of the lists of the most frequent 100 adjectives in the two magazines. Both the adjectives *normal* and *weird* are from the *Cosmopolitan* list, although it is not completely apparent why. One explanation could be that men might generally put more emphasis on discussing things and facts while women tend to show more preference for sharing information and speculations about the behaviour of other people. This idea is supported by some of the sentences where these two adjectives are used and which usually present opinions rather than facts.

The distribution of adjectival evaluative patterns reflects the selection of adjectives to some extent. Overall, the choice and frequency of evaluative patterns in the two

magazines is quite similar, but some sharp contrasts arise in the use of some of the patterns. The first pattern, *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated) appears twice as frequently in *Cosmopolitan* as in *Esquire*, and the choice of adjectives in the two corpora is quite dissimilar – whereas it usually denotes importance in *Cosmopolitan*, it is used to assess difficulty or possibility in *Esquire*. The instances of the second pattern, *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge) + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated), differ to a great extent in the two magazines, with all the examples in *Esquire* being highly regular and those in *Cosmopolitan* irregular. While the adjectives in the *Cosmopolitan* instances are evaluative in their primary meaning, the pattern lends an evaluative meaning to some of the adjectives used in the *Esquire* sentences. Patterns with general nouns, namely *thing*, are more frequent and regular in *Esquire* than in *Cosmopolitan*; most of the *Cosmopolitan* examples denote the emotivity type of evaluation, while the *Esquire* sentences are more variable in terms of evaluation. Overall, it appears that *Cosmopolitan* tends to use more innovative constructions and its use of evaluative patterns is less regular.

Although the majority of instances conformed to the patterns identified by Hunston, Sinclair and Bednarek, several variations have been found; this is especially true for the pattern *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge) + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated) in *Cosmopolitan*, where none of the examples corresponded to the original pattern completely. Moreover, a new sub-pattern, NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* + LINK VERB (hinge) + *TO*-INFINITIVE CLAUSE/*THAT*-CLAUSE (thing evaluated) was found among patterns with general nouns.

The results of the analysis confirm the hypothesis that the use and distribution of evaluative adjectives and evaluative adjectival patterns in the two magazines examined differ in certain respects. The most striking differences occurred in the first part of the analysis, which proved that ‘emotive’ adjectives clearly still have a higher representation in magazines for women. Although the types of evaluation employed in the patterns studied in the second part of the analysis differ in some respects, the contrast in their use

does not seem to be so prominent between the two magazines. An interesting discovery in the second part of the analysis was the fact that evaluative constructions in Cosmopolitan tend to be much more irregular and innovative than in Esquire. In spite of the differences, most of the evaluative adjectives as well as evaluative adjectival patterns have a similar use and distribution, reflecting the fact that the aim of both of these magazines is identical.

10 References and Sources

References

Bednarek, M. (2006) *Evaluation in Media Discourse*. New York: Continuum.

Bednarek, M. (2009), 'Language patterns and ATTITUDE'. *Functions of Language* (16:2). Available on-line from <https://benjamins.com/catalog/fol.16.2.01bed> (accessed: 25 May 2018)

Bednarek, M. (2007) 'Local Grammar and Register Variation: Explorations in Broadsheet and Tabloid Newspaper Discourse'. Available on-line from <http://ejournals.org.uk/ELR/article/2007/1> (accessed: 30 May 2018)

Channel, J. (1994) *Vague Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Du Bois, J.W. (2007) 'The Stance Triangle'. In R.Englebretson (ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Francis, G. 'A corpus-driven approach to grammar: principles, methods and examples'. In Baker, M., G. Francis, and E. Tognini-Bognelli (1993) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gross, M. 'Local grammars and their representation by finite automata'. In Hoey, M. (1993) *Data, Description, Discourse. Papers on the English Language in honour of John McH Sinclair*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Haas, A. (1979) 'Male and Female Spoken Language Differences: Stereotypes and Evidence'. *Psychological Bulletin* (86:3), 623-4. Available on-line from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0d20/2e5e05600222cc0c6f53504e046996fdd3c8.pdf> (accessed: 20 July 2018)

Hanke, R. (1989) 'Mass Media and Lifestyle Differentiation: An Analysis of the Public Discourse about Food'. *Communication* (11). Available on-line from <http://bhanke.apps01.yorku.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/hanke1989a.pdf> (accessed: 30 May 2018)

Hoey, M. (1983) *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Hollow, M. (2011) 'Perfect lives: Lifestyle magazines and utopian impulses in contemporary British society'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (15:17). Available on-line from https://www.academia.edu/881284/Perfect_lives_Lifestyle_magazines_and_utopian_impulses_in_contemporary_British_society (accessed: 18 May 2018)

Holmes, J. (2013) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 4th edn. London: Routledge.

Hunston, S. (2002) *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S. (2011) *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: phraseology and evaluative language*. New York: Routledge.

Hunston, S. and J. Sinclair (2000) 'A local grammar of evaluation'. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunston, S., and G. Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klimczak K.M., and M. Dynel (2018) 'Evaluation Markers and Mitigators in Analyst Reports in Light of Market Response to Stock Recommendations'. *International Journal of Business Communication*. Available on-line from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2487907> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2487907> (accessed: 15 May 2018)

Machin, D., and T. van Leeuwen (2005) 'Language style and lifestyle: the case of a global magazine'. *Media, Culture & Society* (27:4). Available on-line from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0163443705054151?journalCode=mcsa> (accessed: 25 May 2018)

Mason, O. 'Automatic Processing of Local Grammar Patterns'. Available on-line from https://www.academia.edu/400531/Automatic_Processing_of_Local_Grammar_Patterns (accessed: 15 May 2018)

Merry, M.S. (2010) 'Identity'. Available on-line from <https://www.academia.edu/806934/Identity> (accessed: 31 May 2018)

Molodychenko, E.N. (2004) 'Consumerist discourse and ideology: investigating the role of values and evaluation in online men's lifestyle magazines'. Available on-line from https://www.academia.edu/28617186/Consumerist_discourse_and_ideology_investigating_the_role_of_values_and_evaluation_in_online_mens_lifestyle_magazines (accessed: 31 May 2018)

Nordby, H. (2008) 'Values, cultural identity and communication: a perspective from philosophy of language'. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*. Available on-line from <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr17/nordby.htm> (accessed: 4 June 2018)

Xia, X. (2013) 'Gender Differences in Using Language'. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* (3:8). Available on-line from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/08/28.pdf> (accessed: 19 July 2018)

Tools

Anthony, L. (2016). AntConc (3.4.4.0) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>

Anthony, L. (2015). TagAnt (1.2.0) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>

Sources

The on-line version of Cosmopolitan magazine:
<https://www.cosmopolitan.com/uk/beauty-hair/>

The on-line version of Esquire magazine: <https://www.esquire.com/uk/style/>

11 České résumé

Diplomová práce se zabývala použitím evaluativních adjektiv a evaluativních adjektivních vzorců ve dvou časopisech o životním stylu – Cosmopolitanu (pro ženy) a Esquire (pro muže). V teoretické části byla definována evaluace, popsány její jednotlivé funkce a způsoby, jak ji v textu rozpoznávat. Dále byl představen pojem lokální gramatiky a vysvětlen pomocí kontrastu s použitím tradiční gramatiky, popsán tzv. *pattern approach*, se kterým lokální gramatika pracuje, a vyjmenovány jednotlivé evaluativní vzorce, které identifikovali Hunston, Sinclair a Bednarek. V následující části teoretické kapitoly byla nastíněna problematika životního stylu, identity, hodnot, definován koncept časopisů o životním stylu a popsány některé lingvistické prostředky používané v tomto žánru. Nakonec byly krátce představeny rozdíly mezi způsobem vyjadřování žen a mužů a důvody, proč tyto rozdíly přetrvávají.

Východiskem pro praktickou část diplomové práce byla hypotéza, že se použití evaluativních adjektiv a evaluativních adjektivních vzorců v časopisech pro ženy a pro muže bude do jisté míry lišit, zejména z důvodu častějšího používání ‚emotivních‘ přídavných jmen ženami. Lze ovšem očekávat, že vzhledem k podobnému zaměření a účelu obou časopisů, tj. ovlivňovat a utvářet hodnoty, ale také dělat reklamu různým produktům, se zvolené jazykové prostředky nebudou lišit nijak dramaticky.

Analýza vycházela z článků zveřejněných na internetových stránkách obou časopisů. Cosmopolitan je časopis určený pro ženské obecnstvo a pokrývá témata jako krása, celebrity a láska. Esquire je primárně určený pro muže a zabývá se mimo jiné stylem, kulturou a novinkami. Z každého časopisu byla vybrána jedna rubrika – z Cosmopolitanu *Beauty* a z Esquire *Style*. Kritérium pro výběr těchto dvou rubrik bylo, aby si byly co nejpodobnější svým zaměřením, a aby tak výsledky výzkumu nebyly zkreslené přílišnou odlišností témat, jimiž se rubriky zabývají. Z každého časopisu byly excerpovány články, ze kterých byly vytvořeny dva korpusy, každý přibližně o 121 500 tokenech. V obou korpusech byly označovány slovní druhy pomocí programu TagAnt, analýza samotná pak probíhala prostřednictvím korpusového programu AntConc.

Pro první úsek analýzy byl pro oba korpusy vytvořen seznam 100 nejčastěji používaných adjektiv, ze kterého byla vybrána pouze evaluativní adjektiva. Vzhledem k obtížnosti identifikace evaluativních adjektiv byla vybrána jen ta adjektiva, kterým lze evaluativní význam přisoudit s naprostou určitostí. Nejprve byly porovnány oba seznamy, zjištěno, ve kterém z korpusů se evaluativní adjektiva vyskytují častěji a do jaké míry se oba seznamy překrývají. Následně byl popsán výskyt, frekvence a použití jednotlivých adjektiv, a porovnáno užití těch, která se vyskytovala na obou seznamech.

Ačkoli se užití některých adjektiv v obou korpusech příliš nelišilo, z první části analýzy vyplynulo mnoho zajímavých poznatků. Velké množství evaluativních adjektiv použitých v obou časopisech premodifikuje podstatná jména označující produkty, na které dělají časopisy reklamu - v *Cosmopolitanu* jde především o kosmetiku, v *Esquire* o oděvy a obuv. V *Esquire* se evaluativní adjektiva objevují v širším množství kontextů, což se odráží zejména na výběru adjektiv z kategorie vyjadřující ‚emotivitu‘. Zatímco v *Cosmopolitanu* se častěji objevují adjektiva používaná v reklamě (např. *good*, *perfect*), v *Esquire* se více vyskytují ta používaná v širších kontextech (např. *great*, *cool*). Dalším důležitým poznatkem bylo, že v *Cosmopolitanu* je skutečně nápadně vyšší výskyt adjektiv vyjadřujících emoce (např. *perfect*, *amazing*, *dreamy*) než v *Esquire*, což potvrzuje původní hypotézu o rozdílech mezi lingvistickými prostředky používanými ženami a muži. Novým zjištěním bylo, že tato adjektiva se častěji pojí s reklamou, a tudíž se zdá, že v *Cosmopolitanu* dostává reklama více prostoru než v *Esquire*.

Druhá část analýzy se zabývala identifikací a popisem adjektivních evaluativních vzorců v obou korpusech. Výchozím bodem byly evaluativní vzorce popsané v teoretické části práce; byly vyhledány všechny výskyty těchto vzorců v obou korpusech a popsána jejich distribuce a použití. U vzorců s nižším počtem výskytů byly udány frekvenční údaje. Analýza se zaměřila především na sémantické rozdělení adjektiv použitých v jednotlivých vzorcích a na funkce částí vzorců, jak je definuje lokální gramatika. Pokud vzorec obsahoval předložky nebo neurčité slovesné tvary, byly popsány a porovnány jejich funkce a sémantické kategorie adjektiv vyskytujících se v jejich okolí.

Ve většině případů byla distribuce a chování evaluativních adjektivních vzorců v obou korpusech poměrně podobná, ale u některých vyšly najevo pozoruhodné odlišnosti.

První vzorec, *IT* + LINK VERB + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + FINITE/NON-FINITE CLAUSE (thing evaluated), se v Cosmopolitanu objevuje téměř dvakrát častěji než v Esquire; adjektiva, která obsahuje, v Cosmopolitanu většinou vyjadřují důležitost, zatímco ta v Esquire označují obtížnost. U druhého vzorce, *THERE* + LINK VERB + *SOMETHING/ANYTHING/NOTHING* (hinge) + ADJECTIVE GROUP (evaluative category) + *ABOUT/IN* (hinge) + NOUN GROUP/-ING CLAUSE (thing evaluated), je nápadná především nepravidelnost použití v Cosmopolitanu – zatímco všechny věty, ve kterých se vyskytuje v Esquire, se přesně řídí podle vzorce, všechny příklady v Cosmopolitanu se od něj lehce odlišují. Některá z adjektiv objevujících se v tomto vzorci v Esquire původně nemají evaluativní význam, ale v kontextu vzorce jej získávají. Vzorce s obecným podstatným jménem *thing* mají výrazně častější výskyt v Esquire a opět se na rozdíl od příkladů v Cosmopolitanu řídí přesně podle předem určené konstrukce. Oproti tomu více vět v Cosmopolitanu odpovídá nově nalezenému vzorci NOUN GROUP WITH *THING* + LINK VERB (hinge) + *TO*-INFINITIVE CLAUSE/*THAT*-CLAUSE (thing evaluated). Obecně se zdá, že evaluativní vzorce v Esquire mají pravidelnější výskyty, zatímco v Cosmopolitanu se častěji objevují netradiční a inovativní konstrukce.

Výsledky analýzy potvrzují hypotézu, že použití evaluativních adjektiv a adjektivních evaluativních vzorců v Cosmopolitanu a Esquire se v určitých ohledech liší. Nejvýraznější rozdíl se objevil v první části analýzy, která ukázala, že výskyt „emotivních“ adjektiv je skutečně vyšší v časopise pro ženy. Zajímavým zjištěním v druhé části analýzy pak byl fakt, že evaluativní konstrukce v Cosmopolitanu mají větší tendenci odchylovat se od původních vzorců a objevovat se v různých inovativních variacích. Navzdory jmenovaným rozdílům však má většina evaluativních adjektiv i evaluativních adjektivních vzorců ve zkoumaných časopisech podobné použití a distribuci, což je zřejmě výsledkem podobného účelu obou časopisů, tj. propagovat produkty, které nabízí.